

guided by your parents and friends. You have been tested by the trials and tribulations of final examinations and college boards. Your diploma is indicative of the confidence that all of us have in you.

Recognize that you have the basis upon which to build a future. With the knowl-

edge that you now have, you can aspire to any heights of learning. Believe this work with it in mind, and there will be nothing for which you cannot strive. Just keep in mind this old Scottish saying: Grasp a thistle firmly: For if you hesitate or touch it timidly, a thistle stings. But grasp it

firmly, its spines crumble harmlessly in your hand.

So, in life. Each of us must bear one burden or another. But face the problem boldly, come to grips. And, strangely, the thorns that might have hurt, lose the power to sting.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 14, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

JUNE 14, 1965.

I hereby designate the Honorable CARL ALBERT to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOHN W. McCORMACK.

The Reverend A. Reid Jepson, minister, Charleston, W. Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou holy One of Israel, Father of Jesus Christ, and of all who trust Him: On this day of opportunity, at this hour of crisis, in this moment of quietness, we bring to Thee each heart in this House. Who is not in need of cleansing of mind and soul? Each needs wisdom and righteousness from God to solve the problems, to bear the burdens too great for man alone.

We thank Thee for the inspired word oft neglected: "Come now, let us reason together, saith the Lord, though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow"—by Thy grace. Since each shall give account to God for his deeds, may we act in the fear of God and for the good of His people.

Through Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 10, 1965, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1732. An act to amend the act of September 26, 1961, relating to allotment and assignment of pay, to cover the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 1782. An act to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contribution for expenses incurred in the administration of such act.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5874. An act to amend Public Law 815, 81st Congress, with respect to the construction of school facilities for children in Puerto Rico, Wake Island, Guam, or the Virgin Islands for whom local educational agencies are unable to provide education.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 16. An act for the relief of Eugeninsz Lupinski;

S. 68. An act for the relief of Mehdi Heravi;

S. 130. An act for the relief of Felicidad Caletena;

S. 207. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose S. Lastra;

S. 248. An act for the relief of Violet Shina;

S. 358. An act for the relief of Vladimir Gasparovic and Dragica Rendulic Gasparovic;

S. 372. An act for the relief of Antonio Jesus Senra (Rodriguez) and his wife, Mercedes M. Miranda de Senra;

S. 374. An act for the relief of Dr. Guillermo Castrillo (Fernandez);

S. 454. An act for the relief of Lee Hyang Na;

S. 517. An act for the relief of John William Daugherty, Jr.;

S. 521. An act for the relief of Maria Giocconda Femila;

S. 550. An act for the relief of Patrick Anthony Linnane;

S. 551. An act for the relief of Richard Bing-Yin Lam;

S. 573. An act for the relief of Dr. Sedat M. Ayata;

S. 614. An act for the relief of Evangelia Moshou Kantas;

S. 653. An act for the relief of George Palouras (Georgios Palouras);

S. 678. An act for the relief of Lee Hi Sook;

S. 703. An act for the relief of Kimie Okamoto Addington;

S. 778. An act for the relief of Nicola Moric;

S. 857. An act for the relief of Mrs. Styliani Papathanaslou;

S. 1281. An act for the relief of Sister Maria Clotilde Costa;

S. 1483. An act to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 1495. An act to permit variation of the 40-hour workweek of Federal employees for educational purposes;

S. 1496. An act to repeal the provisions of law codified in title 5, section 39, United States Code, and for other purposes;

S. 1620. An act to consolidate the two judicial districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable transitional provisions with respect thereto; and

S. 1698. An act to establish a procedure for a review of proposed bank mergers so as to eliminate the necessity for the dissolution of merged banks, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 6767, the appropriation bill for the Department of Interior and related agencies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered. The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 136]

Abbott	Fulton, Pa.	Nedzi
Andrews	Gialmo	Nelsen
George W.	Gilligan	Nix
Ashbrook	Grabowski	O'Hara, Mich.
Ayres	Green, Oreg.	O'Neill, Mass.
Baring	Grider	Passman
Battin	Gurney	Philbin
Bingham	Hall	Pickle
Bonner	Halleck	Pike
Bow	Halpern	Pirnie
Brademas	Hanna	Powell
Bray	Harsha	Price
Brown, Calif.	Harvey, Ind.	Pucinski
Brown, Ohio	Hays	Randall
Broyhill, N.C.	Hébert	Reid, Ill.
Cahill	Hicks	Reifel
Callaway	Hollifield	Resnick
Chamberlain	Holland	Rhodes, Ariz.
Clawson, Del.	Horton	Ronan
Cleveland	Hull	Roosevelt
Clevenger	Ichord	Rostenkowski
Collier	Jennings	Roybal
Conte	Johnson, Okla.	Ryan
Corman	Keith	St Germain
Craley	Keogh	Saylor
Cunningham	King, N.Y.	Scheuer
Curtin	Langen	Selden
Devine	Latta	Senner
Diggs	Lindsay	Shibley
Dingell	Long, Md.	Smith, Iowa
Donohue	McDowell	Smith, N.Y.
Dow	Macdonald	Stafford
Dulski	Machen	Talcott
Dwyer	Mackie	Thompson, Tex.
Dyal	Madden	Toll
Evins, Tenn.	Martin, Ala.	Tuck
Fascell	Martin, Mass.	Udall
Findley	Martin, Nebr.	Vivian
Fino	Matsunaga	Walker, Miss.
Fisher	Miller	Watkins
Fogarty	Mink	Willis
Ford	Mize	Wilson, Bob
Gerald R.	Moeller	Wilson,
Ford	Morris	Charles H.
William D.	Morrison	Wright
Fraser	Morton	Younger
Frelinghuysen	Mosher	Zablocki

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 297 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

TO ESTABLISH A DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Rules reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 419, Rept. No. 511) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6927)

to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the text of the bill (H.R. 8822) as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill (H.R. 6927). At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PROVIDING ASSISTANCE TO STATES OF CALIFORNIA, OREGON, WASHINGTON, NEVADA, AND IDAHO FOR RECONSTRUCTION OF AREAS DAMAGED BY RECENT FLOODS AND HIGH WATERS

Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 420, Rept. No. 512) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2089) to provide assistance to the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AUTHORIZE ADDITIONAL TRAVEL AUTHORITY TO COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 110 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 110

Resolved, That rule XI(8) (d) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, relating to the Committee on Government Operations, is amended by inserting "or outside" immediately following the word "within".

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, strike out all after the word "Resolved" in line 1 and add the following language: "That the Committee on Government Operations is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations

with respect to matters within its jurisdiction, and for the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit during the present Congress at such times and places either within or without the United States, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings and take such other actions as are authorized under rule XI(8) (d) of the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to the Committee on Government Operations.

"Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190d of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

"Each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection."

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] pending which I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 110 is a travel resolution involving the Government Operations Committee of the House of Representatives. It has been made necessary by a Federal court ruling in Puerto Rico involving the Committee on Un-American Activities which cast some doubt on a similar type of wording in the current travel resolution for the House Committee on Government Operations. It is the same resolution as was voted last year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. As a matter of curiosity, noting the language on line 10, that this committee may "sit during the present Congress at such times and places either within or without the United States," am I to understand from that that a committee of Congress may hold hearings in a foreign country?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes; I think that is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, may I say simply that my understanding of House Resolution 110 is identical with that of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG]. I concur in his remarks and I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution to authorize additional travel authority to the Committee on Government Operations."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON BILLS FROM VETERANS' COMMITTEE TO BE CALLED TODAY

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that each Member have 3 legislative days to extend his remarks in the Record on each of the veterans' bills which will be called up today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I should like to state for the information of the House that there will be a detailed explanation of each bill that is passed, included in the Record.

INCREASE FOR WAR ORPHANS' EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 205) to amend chapter 35 of title 38 of the United States Code in order to increase the educational assistance allowances payable under the war orphans' educational assistance program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 205

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 1732(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "\$110", "\$80", and "\$50" and by inserting in lieu thereof "\$140", "\$105", and "\$70", respectively.

(b) Section 1732(b) of such title is amended by striking out "\$90" and by inserting "\$115" in lieu thereof.

Sec. 2. Section 1742(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "\$110", and "\$35" both times it appears, and "\$3.60" and by inserting in lieu thereof "\$140", "\$45", "\$45", and "\$4.60", respectively.

SEC. 3. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month following the date of enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, beginning line 5, strike out "\$140, \$105, and \$70" and insert "\$130, \$95, and \$60", respectively.

On page 2, line 2, strike out "\$115" and insert "\$105".

On page 2, beginning on line 5, strike out "\$140, \$45, \$45, and \$4.60" and insert "\$130, \$41, \$41, and \$4.25", respectively.

On page 2, beginning on line 8, insert—
"Sec. 3. Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 1701 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out the third and fourth sentences and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'The standards and criteria for determining whether or not a disability arising out of such service is service connected shall be those applicable under chapter 11 of this title.'"

On page 2, line 15, strike out "3" and insert "4".

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say simply, on behalf of myself and the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE] who is one of the senior minority members of the subcommittee that considered most of these veterans bills now being discussed, that we have no objection to them. We think they are good, they are warranted, and should be enacted into law.

I should like to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks following those of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] on each of these bills.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Public Law 634 of the 84th Congress, which subsequently became chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, provided assistance to the children of individuals who lost their lives as a result of service in one of the branches of the Armed Forces during the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict, and, under certain conditions, periods of service thereafter.

The assistance provided is in the form of a monthly payment which ranges from a high of \$110 a month for a full-time education course to \$50 a month for a half-time course. The age limitations generally are 18 to 23, and in effect this program authorizes assistance during a 4-year college course, since the payments authorized run for a maximum of 36 months—the equivalent of 4 school years.

Public Law 88-361 extended this same program to the children of living veterans who are totally disabled from service-connected causes.

There has been no increase in the rates indicated above since the program was first proposed in March of 1956.

Since that date, there has been an increase in the cost of living of 16.6 percent.

The rates proposed in this bill are \$130 a month for a full-time course, \$95 for a course being taken on the basis of three-quarter time, and \$60 a month for a half-time course. These rates reflect the cost of living since 1956.

Existing law for war orphan eligibility requires a disability arising out of service during the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, and Korea, or the induction period. For service during a period of war the criteria for a determination of service connection for purposes of disability compensation apply. For service during the induction period, however, it must be shown that the disability occurred as a direct result from the performance of active military, naval, or air service or have resulted from first, armed conflict; or second, from an injury or disease while engaged in extrahazardous service. The amendment proposed by section 3 of this bill removes the restrictions on the individuals serving in the induction period by providing the same basis for determination of service connection as is applicable to a veteran suffering a disability during a period of war. Basically, it would cover those individuals who served and who are service connected beginning with February 1, 1955, and continuing so long as the draft is in effect.

Hearings were held on this proposal before the Subcommittee on Education and Training on June 1, 1965.

The cost of the increases in the educational assistance allowances provided by the bill as reported is:

Fiscal year:	
1966.....	\$5,704,000
1967.....	5,892,000
1968.....	6,392,000
1969.....	6,629,000
1970.....	5,690,000
Total.....	30,307,000

The Veterans' Administration favored lesser rates but supported the objective.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 205. This bill will increase the educational assistance allowance provided to war orphans who are pursuing courses of education and training under Public Law 634 of the 84th Congress, the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act. At the present time the law provides an allowance of \$110 monthly for those pursuing full-time training; \$80 monthly for three-quarters time and \$50 monthly for half time. These rates were established at the time the legislation was first enacted in 1956. There has been no increase since that time. Meanwhile, cost of living has risen approximately 16.6 percent since that date. You will note from the statistics furnished by the Office of Education contained in the committee report on this bill that the total cost of attending college has risen in the case of public schools from \$1,260 annually in 1956-57 to \$1,560 at the present time. The increase is even greater in the case of private colleges. This bill will increase the educational allow-

ance rates already mentioned to \$130, \$95, and \$60, respectively.

In addition, the bill will eliminate the requirement that the veteran's death or total disability must have occurred as a result of first, armed conflict; or second, from injury or disease while engaged in extrahazardous service; or third, have arisen out of the performance of active duty in the case of those veterans with service after January 31, 1955. I urge that the bill be passed.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join today in support of the six veterans' bills on the Consent Calendar reported to the House by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs after weeks of careful and thoughtful consideration. At this time I should like to compliment Chairman TEAGUE for the leadership he has given during his years in Congress to legislative matters concerning all phases of veterans' legislation.

I had the great privilege of serving for a short time on Chairman TEAGUE's committee, and a member cannot help but be impressed there by his disposition to our veterans and his conscientious work on their behalf.

A grateful nation has built our unique system of veteran benefits, and these bills on our calendar today strengthen and improve this benefit system which recognizes the magnificent service our men and women have given this Nation. No one needs more the additional benefits today than the children of those men who lost their lives for our country.

In H.R. 206 and H.R. 208 there is a recognition of improved vocational rehabilitation training allowances, which are long overdue. Again, on all these bills it is a privilege to give support and to again thank the committee for their recognition of our veteran needs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 38 of the United States Code in order to increase the educational assistance allowances payable under the war orphans' educational assistance program, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASE FOR SERVICE-CONNECTED TRAINEES

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 206) to provide a realistic cost-of-living increase in rates of subsistence allowances paid to disabled veterans pursuing vocational rehabilitation training and to the sons and daughters of deceased or permanently and totally disabled veterans

pursuing a program of education under the war orphans' educational assistance program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a)

section 1504 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting subsection (c) thereof, redesignating subsection (d) as "(c)" and by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) The subsistence allowance of a veteran-trainee is to be determined in accordance with the following table, and shall be the monthly amount shown in column II, III, or IV (whichever is applicable as determined by the veteran's dependency status) opposite the appropriate type of training as specified in column I:

"Column I Type of training	Column II No dependents	Column III One dependent	Column IV Two or more dependents
Full-time institutional training.....	\$110 95	\$150 125	\$175 150
Institutional on-farm, apprentice or other on-job training.....			

Where any trainee has more than two dependents and is not eligible to receive additional compensation as provided by section 315 or section 335 (whichever is applicable) of this title, the subsistence allowance prescribed in column IV of the foregoing table shall be increased by an additional \$5 per month for each dependent in excess of two."

(b) Section 315 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting "(a)" and subsection (b) thereof.

(c) Any veteran-trainee receiving subsistence allowance on the date of the enactment of this Act while pursuing a course of vocational rehabilitation authorized by chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, shall not have such allowance reduced by reason of the amendments contained in such Act.

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (a) of section 1732 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "\$110," "\$80," and "\$50" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$140," "\$105," and "\$70," respectively.

(b) Subsection (b) of section 1732 is amended by striking out "\$90" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$115".

(c) Subsection (a) of section 1742 of title 38 is amended by striking out "\$110," "\$35" both times it appears, and "\$3.60" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$140," "\$45," and "\$45" and "\$4.60," respectively.

SEC. 3. The foregoing provisions of this Act shall become effective on the first day of the second calendar month which begins following the date of enactment of this Act.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide a realistic cost-of-living increase in rates of subsistence allowances paid to disabled veterans pursuing vocational rehabilitation training."

With the following committee amendments:

Beginning on page 3, line 1, strike out down to and including line 10.

On page 3, line 11, strike out "3" and insert "2".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Public Law 16 of the 78th Congress, enacted in 1943—subsequently codified as chapter 31, title 38, United States Code—authorized vocational rehabilitation—education and training—for veterans in

need thereof to overcome the handicap of a service-connected disability.

Under this program, the Veterans' Administration gives the veteran certain tests to determine the type of training which he needs to overcome his disability. Thereafter, he is afforded an opportunity to take this training, with the Veterans' Administration paying the full academic or training cost in addition to a subsistence allowance, which is paid on a sliding scale, depending on the degree of his disability and the number of dependents that he may have. This present payment varies generally from \$75 to \$120 per month. There is a floor on the combined rate of subsistence allowance and disability compensation which varies from \$105 per month for an unmarried veteran with a disability rated less than 30 percent to \$135 per month, with additional amounts for dependents, in cases of veterans with disabilities rated 30 percent or more and who have dependents. The subsistence allowance is paid in conjunction with the veteran's service-connected compensation.

The current basic rates of vocational rehabilitation subsistence allowance have been in effect since April 1, 1948. Since that time, the cost of living has increased approximately 30 percent. Obviously, these subsistence allowances have not kept pace with the rise of living cost and do not now furnish anything like the same degree of assistance which was furnished immediately after World War II, or even during the period of the Korean conflict.

Nearly 700,000 veterans have been trained under this program, and in March of 1965 there were approximately 1,500 veterans taking this sort of training under the auspices of the Veterans' Administration.

In order to simplify administration and to provide for a greater degree of equity, subsistence payments have been simplified and increased to the level shown in the table which follows:

Col. I—Type of training	Col. II—No dependents	Col. III—1 dependent	Col. IV—2 or more dependents
Full-time institutional training.....	\$110 95	\$150 125	\$175 150
Institutional on-farm, apprentice, or other on-job training.....			

These amounts are above and beyond the amount of disability compensation payable to the veteran.

The cost of this bill, as reported, is estimated to be:

Fiscal year:	
1966.....	\$2,200,000
1967.....	1,800,000
1968.....	1,600,000
1969.....	1,300,000
1970.....	1,200,000

Total, 1st 5 years..... 8,100,000

Hearings were held on this proposal before the Subcommittee on Education and Training on June 1, 1965.

A favorable report of the Veterans' Administration indicated support of the need to increase the rates but to a lesser degree.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I support the provisions of H.R. 206. As you know, a program of vocational rehabilitation to overcome occupational handicaps created as a result of service-connected disabilities has been in existence since World War II. Under that program, the Veterans' Administration pays for the disabled veteran the full academic or of the program he is pursuing. In addition, they pay to the veteran a subsistence allowance on a sliding scale depending upon the degree of disability and the number of dependents that he has. The monthly payment varies generally from \$75 to \$120 per month.

The present basic rates of subsistence allowance for vocational rehabilitation have been in effect since April 1, 1948. Despite the rising cost of education and the cost of living, these subsistence allowances have lagged far behind. H.R. 206 proposes to increase these monthly payments by approximately 30 percent. It is estimated that the cost of living has increased to this same degree since 1948. The new rates will range from \$95 monthly to \$175.

I support this legislation as it being in the best interest of the Nation's service-connected disabled veterans and urge my colleagues to vote affirmatively thereon.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide a realistic cost-of-living increase in rates of subsistence paid to disabled veterans pursuing vocational rehabilitation program."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TIME OF TRAINING FOR TOTALLY DISABLED VETERANS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 208) to amend chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, to extend to all totally disabled veterans the same liberalization of time limits for pursuing vocational rehabilitation training as was authorized for blinded veterans by Public Law 87-591, and to clarify the language of the law relating to the limiting of periods

for pursuing such training, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 1502 thereof the following new section 1503:

"§ 1503. Periods of eligibility

"(a) Unless a longer period of eligibility is authorized pursuant to subsection (b) or (c) of this section, vocational rehabilitation may not be afforded to a veteran after nine years following his discharge or release; except vocational rehabilitation may be afforded to any person until—

"(1) August 20, 1963, if such person was discharged or released before August 20, 1954, or

"(2) October 15, 1971, if such person is eligible for vocational rehabilitation by reason of a disability arising from service before October 15, 1962, but either after World War II, and before the Korean conflict, or after the Korean conflict.

"(b) Where a veteran is prevented from entering, or having entered, from completing vocational rehabilitation training within the period of eligibility prescribed in subsection (a) of this section because—

"(1) he had not timely attained, retained, or regained medical feasibility for training because of disability;

"(2) he had not timely met the requirement of a discharge or release under conditions other than dishonorable, but the nature of such discharge or release was later changed by appropriate authority; or

"(3) he had not timely established the existence of a compensable service-connected disability,

"(c) A veteran who is found to be in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of blindness, or other total disability, resulting from a service-connected disability which affords basic eligibility for vocational rehabilitation under section 1502 of this title may be afforded such vocational rehabilitation after the termination date otherwise applicable to him, but not beyond ten years after such termination date, or June 30, 1975, whichever date is the later, if—

"(1) he had not previously been rehabilitated (that is, rendered employable) as the result of training furnished under this chapter, or

"(2) the total disability (whether blindness or otherwise) has developed from, or as a result of, the worsening of his service-connected disability since he was declared rehabilitated to the extent that it precludes his performing the duties of the occupation for which he was previously trained under this chapter."

Sec. 2. Chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, is further amended by—

(1) deleting in the table of sections at the head thereof:

"1502A. Blinded veterans"

"1503. Training and training facilities"

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"1503. Periods of eligibility"

and adding to the end of such table the following:

"1511. Training and training facilities".

(2) deleting subsection (c) of section 1502 (except paragraph (4) thereof), and changing "(4)" immediately preceding "Vocational rehabilitation" in such section to "(c)";

(3) deleting section 1502A;

(4) redesignating section 1503 "Training and training facilities" as section 1511 and transferring that section, as so redesignated, to the end of the chapter.

Sec. 3. Any veteran entitled to vocational rehabilitation training under chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, until July 25, 1965, pursuant to section 1502(c) (2) of such title, prior to the amendment made by this Act, shall continue to have the right to receive such training until such date, notwithstanding the amendments made by sections 1 and 2 hereof.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, to extend to seriously disabled veterans the same liberalization of time limits for pursuing vocational rehabilitation training as was authorized for blinded veterans by Public Law 87-591, and to clarify the language of the law relating to the limiting of periods for pursuing such training."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 3, line 6, strike out "total" and insert "serious".

On page 3, line 16, strike out "the total" and insert "such serious".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, originally enacted as Public Law 16 of the 78th Congress, authorized vocational rehabilitation and training for veterans who have incurred service-connected disability during their period of service. As the program now exists it covers all veterans beginning with World War II and it is a permanent program for the service-connected veterans of present service. There is no initiation date, but, generally speaking, vocational rehabilitation may not be afforded after 9 years following the date of his discharge or release from active service.

A special exception to this general limiting date is found in the case of a blinded veteran who has until June 30, 1975, or 10 years after the general termination date, where it is determined that he has not been previously rehabilitated as a result of his training or where his disability has worsened to such a degree that the training which was originally given him no longer fits him to perform the duties for which he was trained. This bill, as introduced, proposed to extend this special provision, applicable only to blinded veterans, to all veterans who are totally disabled. As reported, it covers all seriously disabled service connected.

The cost of this legislation, as reported, is estimated at less than \$1,400,000 for fiscal year 1966 and approximately \$16 million for the first 5 years.

It is favored by the Veterans' Administration.

Some examples of seriously disabled veterans are:

First. A veteran with multiple sclerosis in fairly good state of remission is trained as an electronics technician whose disability has now progressed to the point where digital dexterity has been greatly affected and requires retraining.

Second. A veteran with osteomyelitis rated 20 percent was trained as a linotype operator. Osteomyelitis flared up and required amputation of forearm and he must be retrained.

Third. A veteran with 30 anxiety reaction was trained as a salesman where he has to meet the public. The condition progresses to 80-percent evaluation and contact with the public is no longer compatible with his condition.

Fourth. An epileptic with condition completely controlled by medication, which carries a 10-percent rating. The condition has deteriorated to a point where he experiences one or more compulsive seizures on the job in spite of medication. While his evaluation may only have progressed to 30 percent or 50 percent, his job is no longer feasible and he requires retraining.

Fifth. A veteran rated 60 percent for amputation of left forearm, has prosthesis to which he adjusted and was trained as turret lathe operator. The condition worsened and required amputation at the shoulder, where prosthesis is no longer applicable and retraining is required.

Sixth. Veteran with 30 percent rating for arthritis. He was rehabilitated as an office worker, requiring a minimum amount of moving about. Now his condition has worsened to a point where he requires a static job, such as bookkeeper or accounting, where no movement at all is required, and this would require further training.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 208. This bill will extend to all totally disabled and other seriously disabled veterans the same time limits for pursuing vocational rehabilitation training as was extended to blinded veterans by Public Law 87-591. Generally speaking, service-connected disabled veterans who are entitled to vocational rehabilitation must complete their participation in this program within 9 years following discharge or release from active service. In the case of blinded veterans, however, this general time limitation is extended until June 30, 1975, or 10 years after the general termination date. H.R. 208 will continue the extension for blinded veterans but will broaden it to afford similar extensions to all individuals having a serious disability resulting from a service-connected disease or injury which creates an occupational handicap.

I believe this extension of time is warranted and urge that it be passed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, to extend to seriously disabled veterans the same liberalization of time limits for pursuing vocational rehabilitation training as was authorized for blinded veterans by Public Law 87-591, and to clarify the language of the law relating to the limiting of periods for pursuing such training."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAR ORPHAN BENEFITS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further

consideration of the bill (H.R. 227) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to entitle the children of certain veterans who served in the Armed Forces prior to September 16, 1940, to benefit under the war orphans educational assistance program, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1701(a)(9)(A) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "the period beginning September 16, 1940, and ending December 6, 1941," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the period beginning July 5, 1902, and ending December 6, 1941, but not including any period of war,"

SEC. 2. In the case of any individual who is an "eligible person" within the meaning of section 1701(a)(1) of title 38, United States Code, solely by virtue of the amendment made by this Act, and who is above the age of seventeen years and below the age of twenty-three years on the date of enactment of this Act, the period referred to in section 1712 of title 38, United States Code, shall not end with respect to such individual until the expiration of the five-year period which begins on the date of enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike lines 3 through 8 on page 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That (a) the first sentence of section 1701(a)(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

The term "eligible person" means a child of a person who—

(A) died of a service-connected disability, or

(B) has a total disability permanent in nature resulting from a service-connected disability, or who died while a disability so evaluated was in existence, arising out of active military, naval, or air service after the beginning of the Spanish-American War and prior to the end of the induction period, but only if such service did not terminate under dishonorable conditions.

(b) Such section 1701(a)(1) is further amended by deleting the second sentence thereof and by striking "during the induction period" in the fourth sentence and inserting in lieu thereof: "other than during a period of war".

(c) Paragraph 9 of such section 1701(a) is amended by deleting therefrom the following: "(A) the period beginning September 16, 1940, and ending December 6, 1941, and the period beginning January 1, 1947, and ending June 26, 1950, and (B)".

(d) Section 1701(d) of such title 38 is amended by deleting "during the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or the induction period," and inserting in lieu thereof: "after the beginning of the Spanish-American War and prior to the end of the induction period."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to make war orphans' educational assistance, authorized by chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, available to the sons and

daughters of those veterans who died or were totally and permanently disabled from a service-connected disability which directly resulted from the performance of active duty, or was incurred while engaged in extrahazardous service, during peacetime periods after the Spanish-American War and prior to September 16, 1940.

It appears to the committee that this is indeed a reasonable extension of the basic purpose of the war orphans' education assistance program. In view of the fact that this benefit is available generally only to individuals between the ages of 18 and 23 and for higher education, its application would be extremely limited.

The total cost of this proposed bill will not exceed \$400,000.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, at the present time war orphans educational assistance is available to the sons and daughters of veterans who died or were totally disabled as the result of military service during time of war. In addition, the benefit is available to the sons and daughters of veterans who served during peacetime periods after September 16, 1940, and were disabled or died as the result of the performance of active duty or while engaged in extra hazardous service. This bill, H.R. 227, will extend the benefit of war orphans educational assistance to the sons and daughters of otherwise eligible veterans who served during peacetime after the Spanish-American War and prior to September 16, 1940.

Because of the low rate of military pay during earlier peacetime years, we can assume that it would have been difficult for veterans to have accumulated adequate savings to insure the education of their children in the event of death or total disability due to the performance of military duty. It seems reasonable, therefore, to extend this benefit in this manner. Because the benefit is available generally only to individuals between the ages of 18 and 23 for higher education, very few individuals would qualify under the liberalization. In fact, the Veterans' Administration has estimated that the total cost of this bill would not exceed \$400,000.

I urge H.R. 227 be passed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPEAL OF CHAPTER 33, TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 235) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to repeal the provisions relating to education of Korean conflict veterans, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as

the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] correctly stated, all of these bills under consideration today came out of the appropriate subcommittees and the full Committee on Veterans' Affairs by unanimous vote.

However, in the interests of clarification, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], whether or not it is true that these bills which we have so far considered, including this one, are involved with cost-of-living increases in monthly allowances for service-connected veterans pursuing vocational rehabilitation courses and for war orphans pursuing educational programs?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The gentleman is exactly correct. These bills deal with our very seriously service-connected disabled veterans and basically provide cost-of-living increases for veterans taking vocational rehabilitation or war orphans.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to tell the Members of the House that the next bill is one that repeals the so-called Korean GI bill which expired January 31, 1965. It does not cost anything. It merely keeps title 38 of the United States Code up to date.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I do this to ask the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] if in these bills anywhere there is provision made for the soldiers now serving in Vietnam?

I understand that they are entitled to a good many of the privileges and prerogatives of veterans of other wars. However, there are some places where they do not receive the benefits to which veterans of other wars are entitled.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] if in the Veterans' Affairs Committee at this time there is any bill pending to give those benefits to these boys who are actually fighting the war and to whom I believe all of these benefits should be given?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I will say to the gentleman from Florida, who does a wonderful job on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and who has sat through all of the hearings on the various hospital proposals, that we have a number of bills along that line now pending in the committee.

We have advised the executive branch of the Government we expect to hold hearings and try to work out the problem of the men in Vietnam and other places around the world. These bills apply to the men in Vietnam, they will only apply to a service-connected disability. The men in Vietnam are not entitled to nonservice pension or nonservice hospitalization, but H.R. 205 and

H.R. 206 bills do apply to the men in Vietnam. Under unanimous consent I include a résumé of benefits available to men of service in South Vietnam:

BENEFITS AVAILABLE TO VETERANS OF SERVICE IN SOUTH VIETNAM

The following broad range of benefits are available to veterans of service in South Vietnam:

COMPENSATION

Service in South Vietnam is considered as extrahazardous service under conditions simulating war. For this reason a veteran suffering a service-connected disability while serving in South Vietnam is entitled to compensation at wartime rates ranging from \$20 per month for 10-percent disability to \$250 for total disability; and from \$340 to \$725 for more severely disabled.

Dependency and indemnity compensation is payable to the qualified survivors of servicemen now serving, where death resulted from a service-connected disease or injury. The formula is \$120 per month plus 12 percent of the base pay of the person who served—payable to widows; other amounts payable to children and dependent parents.

SOCIAL SECURITY

All individuals serving after January 1, 1957, are covered on a contributory basis. Examples of possible benefits under this program follow:

A man in pay grade E-3 (private, first class) with more than 2 years and less than 5 years' service, dies. He is survived by a widow and two children. The widow will receive a monthly payment of \$128 until the older child reaches age 18, when the payment drops to \$113. It remains at this level until the younger child is 18, at which time payment stops. Upon reaching the age of 62, the widow will begin to receive payments of \$62 per month for the rest of her life if she does not remarry.

A man in pay grade E-5 (sergeant or petty officer), with more than 8 and less than 10 years' service, dies. He has been making a contribution to social security for 8 years. He is survived by a widow and two children. The widow will receive a monthly payment of \$202 until the older child reaches age 18, when the payment drops to \$143. It remains at this level until the younger child is 18, at which time payment stops. Upon reaching the age of 62, the widow will begin to receive payments of \$78 per month for the rest of her life if she does not remarry.

A man in pay grade O-3 (captain), with more than 8 and less than 10 years' service, dies. He has been making a contribution to social security for 8 years. He is survived by a widow and two children. The widow will receive a monthly payment of \$254 until the older child reaches age 18, when the payment drops to \$191. It remains at this level until the younger child is 18, at which time payment stops. Upon reaching the age of 62, the widow will begin to receive payments of \$105 per month for the rest of her life if she does not remarry.

Disability payments are made to a veteran with sufficient coverage when total disability is found by social security standards and this benefit would be in addition to Veterans' Administration compensation.

HOSPITALIZATION

Medical care and treatment, inpatient and outpatient, for any service-connected disability. Inpatient medical care if discharged for a service-connected disability or entitled to compensation.

EDUCATION

A veteran of current service is entitled to vocational rehabilitation training if he has a compensable service-connected disability of 30 percent or more, or if less, can show clearly that he has a pronounced employment handi-

cap resulting from a service-connected disability, and the Veterans' Administration determines a need for vocational rehabilitation.

War orphans' education assistance is payable (\$110 per month for full-time courses for 3 calendar years between ages 18 and 23) to a qualified beneficiary of a veteran whose death or total disability of a permanent nature is service incurred while serving in South Vietnam, based on the same criteria as is applied to a veteran of wartime service.

HOUSING

Assistance in the purchase of specially adapted housing through a grant of up to \$10,000 is available where the veteran has a service-connected disability entitling him to compensation for permanent and total disability due to loss or loss of use of both lower extremities or blindness plus loss or loss of use of one lower extremity.

SOLDIERS' AND SAILORS' CIVIL RELIEF ACT

While serving and for 2 years thereafter, the premiums and interest on eligible commercial life insurance policies not exceeding \$10,000 on the life of the serviceman may be guaranteed by the Government under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act. This same act provides protection in meeting financial obligations.

REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

This right is identical in coverage and purpose to that provided World War II and Korean conflict veterans.

INSURANCE

Available to veterans with service-connected disabilities. Application must be made within 1 year from date of determination of service connection.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Covered by a program similar to that provided for Federal civilian employees.

SIX MONTHS' DEATH GRATUITY

This benefit ranges from a minimum of \$800 to a maximum of \$3,000 based on rank and is payable to widow, children, parents, brothers, or sisters.

BURIAL BENEFITS

Reimbursement for burial expenses is provided for in the case of any veteran of current service if he was in receipt of service-connected compensation at the time of his death or was discharged or retired for disability incurred in line of duty and the next of kin is entitled to a burial flag if the deceased veteran had served one enlistment or was discharged for a service-incurred disability. Any veteran whose last period of service terminated honorably is entitled to burial in a national cemetery and a headstone or grave marker.

Mr. HALEY. May I say that I hope the Congress and the committee will proceed as rapidly as they can to give to these men of ours who are fighting the war—we do not have to kid ourselves about that, because they are dying every day—these benefits, and I hope we can proceed to give them all of the benefits that the veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean war are entitled to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 235

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) The analysis of part III of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out

"33. Education of Korean conflict veterans..... 1601".

(c) The analysis of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out

"33. Education of Korean conflict veterans..... 1601".

SEC. 2. (a) Chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1511. Advisory Committee

"(a) There shall be an Advisory Committee formed by the Administrator which shall be composed of persons who are eminent in their respective fields of education, labor, and management, and of representatives of the various types of institutions and establishments furnishing education and training to veterans enrolled under this chapter and under chapter 35 of this title. The Commissioner and the Director, Bureau of Apprenticeship, Department of Labor, shall be ex officio members of the Advisory Committee. The Administrator shall advise and consult with the committee from time to time with respect to the administration of this chapter and chapter 35 of this title, and the committee may make such reports and recommendations as it deems desirable to the Administrator and to the Congress."

(b) The analysis of chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"1511. Advisory Committee."

(c) Until changed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs or by resignation, the membership of the Advisory Committee provided for in section 1511 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a) of this section, shall be made up of the membership, as of January 31, 1965, of the Advisory Committee provided for in section 1662 of title 38, United States Code, which is repealed by the first section of this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) Section 102(a)(2) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "Except for purposes of chapter 33 of this title, dependency" and by inserting in lieu thereof "Dependency".

(b) Section 102(b) of such title is amended by striking out "chapters 19 and 33" and inserting in lieu thereof "chapter 19".

(c) Section 111(a) of such title is amended by striking out "33 or".

(d) Section 211(a) of such title is amended by striking out "784, 1661, 1761" and inserting in lieu thereof "784 and 1761".

(e) Section 1711(b) of such title is amended by striking out "or 33" and by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: "or under chapter 33 of this title as in effect before February 1, 1965".

(f) Section 1734 of such title is amended by striking out (1) "(a)", (2) "or 33", and (3) all of subsection (b) thereof.

(g) (1) Section 1735 of such title is repealed.

(2) The analysis of chapter 35 of such title is amended by striking out

"1735. Approval of courses."

(h) Section 1736 of such title is amended by striking out (1) "(a)" and (2) all of subsection (b) thereof.

(i) Section 1771(a) of such title is amended by striking out "after the date for the expiration of all education and training provided for in chapter 33 of this title. Such agency may be the agency designated or created in accordance with section 1641 of this title".

(j) Section 1776(a) is amended by striking out "1653 or".

(k) Section 3013 of such title is amended by striking out "chapters 31, 33, and 35" and inserting in lieu thereof "chapters 31 and 35".

SEC. 3. Nothing in this Act or any amendment or repeal made by it, shall affect any right or liability (civil or criminal) which matured before the effective date of this Act; and all offenses committed, and all penalties and forfeitures incurred, under any provision of law amended or repealed by this Act, may be punished or recovered, as the case may be, in the same manner and with the same effect as if such amendments or repeals had not been made.

SEC. 4. The amendments and repeals made by this Act shall take effect on February 1, 1965.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 5, strike out "(a)".

On page 4, line 16, strike out "3" and insert "4".

On page 5 strike out lines 1 and 2.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Public Law 550 of the 82d Congress, which subsequently became chapter 33 of title 38 of the United States Code, provided education and training for veterans of the Korean conflict. Over 2,390,000 veterans were provided educational assistance under this law.

All eligibility for training under this program ended on January 31, 1965. The purpose of this bill is to repeal as obsolete the provisions of chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code, in order to keep this title of the United States Code up to date and uncluttered by provisions of law which are no longer applicable.

There would be no cost as a result of the enactment of this proposal.

The GI bill of rights has had a very interesting history. January 31, 1965, marked the termination of all education and training under the Korean GI bill. That law, enacted in the summer of 1952 as the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, provided a range of benefits to assist the returning serviceman in making a satisfactory readjustment to civilian life. In principle, it was similar to the earlier Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, under which more than 7,800,000 World War II veterans trained; however, the Korean GI bill took advantage of experience under the earlier act and established a concept of a package payment, in which the assistance furnished the veteran was in the nature of a scholarship grant to assist the veteran in meeting expenses of tuition, books, subsistence, and so forth.

As of the time the program terminated, 2,390,700 Korean veterans had taken training under the act, and \$4,519,600,000 had been expended for direct benefits. Since there will be some retroactive payments made for persons under training prior to the termination of the program but who have not received all allowances to which they are entitled, it is estimated that the entire cost will be in the neighborhood of \$4,521 million.

The final breakdown of training provided is not available. As of June 30, 1964, 1,217,560 had trained in institutions of higher learning; 859,454 had trained in schools below college level; 214,863 had taken on-job training; and 95,494 had taken on-farm training. The veterans who have trained under this program pursued courses leading to their

chosen objectives in thousands of varied types of educational institutions and training establishments. As a result, many teachers, doctors, lawyers, engineers, scientists, nurses, and men and women trained to other professions or trades have been added to the manpower of each State.

The effect of these educational programs has reached, directly or indirectly, into practically every American home. This program, together with the World War II program for veterans' education, has been called the largest mass adult education and training program ever undertaken, and the full impact on the economy of the country in increased earnings, the value of the increase in the number of skilled and professional manpower, reduced unemployment, and other benefits has not been fully measured.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 235 will repeal as obsolete the provisions of chapter 33 of title 38 of the United States Code, which is commonly referred to as the educational benefits of the Korean GI bill. Inasmuch as the education program under the Korean GI bill terminated January 31, 1965, there is no reason for the continuation of this obsolete law as a part of title 38. Those provisions of the law which remain in effect are, under provisions of this bill, transferred to other chapters of title 38. There is no cost attached to the bill and the Veterans' Administration recommends its adoption. I urge its approval.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIZE OF FLAGS FURNISHED BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2656) to amend subsection (a) of section 901 of title 38, United States Code, to prescribe the size of flags furnished by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to drape the caskets of deceased veterans, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 901 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Each such flag shall measure five feet in width and nine and one-half feet in length."

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill will prescribe as the size of the flag, given by the Veterans' Administration to drape the caskets of deceased veterans, as 5 feet in width and 9½ feet in length.

In 1963, an administrative decision was made to reduce the size of the flag to 4½ by 7 feet. This decision was approved by the Administrator of General Serv-

ices under date of May 27, 1963, and flags of this size are now being used by the Veterans' Administration.

There have been numerous complaints from veterans' organizations and recipients of the flag as to its size, that the present size does not actually cover the entire casket at the time of the funeral.

This legislation would require the Veterans' Administration to revert to its former practice of issuing the flag of 5 by 9½ feet and it is estimated it would cost 40 cents additional for each of the 180,000 flags issued each year for a total cost of \$72,000 per year.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 2656, will prescribe the size of flags furnished by the Veterans' Administration to drape the caskets of deceased veterans.

Until 1963, the flag in use for this purpose was 5 by 9½ feet. A flag of this size was adequate to cover the casket. In 1963 the Veterans' Administration arbitrarily reduced the size of the flag to 4½ by 7 feet. Complaints have been received by Members of Congress from veterans' organizations and the next of kin of deceased veterans that the flag being used was entirely too small to adequately cover the casket. I concur in these complaints and believe that the slight additional cost of the larger flag is most certainly warranted. I therefore recommend the passage of H.R. 2656.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 2656, a bill to prescribe the size of burial flags. For many years the standard size of the burial flag was 5 feet by 9½ feet. This size is also used by the military and experience has shown this is the size needed to carry out the proper burial ritual by veterans organizations.

In 1963 the size of the flag issued by the Veterans' Administration was arbitrarily reduced to 4½ by 7 feet. Hundreds of complaints have been received from veterans organizations.

In the 88th Congress I introduced legislation to correct this action by the Veterans' Administration. Again in the 89th Congress I introduced H.R. 1725, a bill similar to H.R. 2656 in text, that will amend the code and provide a 5- by 9½-foot flag for burial purposes.

I strongly support this needed change as incorporated in H.R. 2656.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHICAGO'S RECEPTION TO ASTRONAUTS HITS ALLTIME RECORD

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is a day in history. Chicago is doing honors to Astronauts Edward White and James McDivitt in a celebra-

tion that probably sets an alltime record in the number of persons participating and depth of enthusiasm. From the Congress of the United States goes warmest congratulations to Mayor Richard J. Daley and the people of Chicago.

PERSECUTION AND HARASSMENT OF RELIGIOUS GROUPS BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the news that persecution and harassment of religious groups exists behind the Iron Curtain within the U.S.S.R.—Russia—and Eastern European countries comes as no surprise to Americans. Members of Congress, and to all free people. This persecution in varying degrees of intensity is continuing to Christian, Jewish, and Muslim citizens. The harassment and infringing upon the inherent rights of religions through confiscatory taxation and closing of religious institutions, deliberate suppression of religious education, interference with religious and related cultural practices, denial of regular contacts between religious bodies in their countries with similar bodies in other parts of the world must be admitted.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I would like to state that this committee has just completed hearings on this very subject. We had extensive testimony from members of all faiths, Jewish, Muslim, Orthodox, Protestant, and Catholic on the manner in which religious persecution, both overt and covert, continues in Communist countries. The purpose of these hearings was not to be just a reminder of lest we forget nor that we thought we might be able to stop such persecution—but my reason, personally, was to expose the hypocrisy of Communist guarantees by proving that the leaders of Communist governments do not live up to their guarantees. If they would match the words of their constitutions which guarantee religious freedom to all peoples, hearings such as ours would not be necessary. They try to deny persecution exists by pointing to “showcases” of churches and synagogues being opened while all the time the countless persecution of religion goes on.

Your Subcommittee on Europe passed a resolution unanimously on this subject. It is now pending before the full Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and I hope action will be taken on this shortly. It is my hope that the governments of the Soviet Union and the governments of the eastern European countries will grant the exercise of religious rights and related cultural pursuits to all the people living within their nations.

I hope our small action will alert the governments behind the Iron Curtain

that we only seek the guarantee of the rights of all peoples.

I have requested unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article which appears in the New York Times of June 14, 1965, with which I take issue. I regret that an outstanding member of the Jewish faith, Dr. Nahum Goldmann, has disagreed that persecution is taking place. I insert this article from the New York Times in the RECORD:

ZIONISTS DISAVOW GOLDMANN'S POSITION ON SOVIET

(By W. Granger Blair)

JERUSALEM (ISRAEL SECTOR), June 14.—The Jewish Agency for Israel has disavowed remarks made on Soviet Jews by Dr. Nahum Goldmann, president of the World Zionist Organization.

Dr. Goldmann contended last week that public criticism and appeals for a change in Soviet treatment of Jews were ineffective, “too often being distorted” and sometimes harmful. He advocated “quiet diplomacy.”

A Jewish agency spokesman said that the opinions, expressed at a news conference in New York last Thursday, were “personal and did not reflect the policies of the World Zionist Organization. The agency and the WZO have overlapping functions and aims in the promotion of Zionism.

The Jewish agency was particularly upset that Dr. Goldmann at his news conference had not repeated his statement of a month ago that all his political statements were made in a private capacity and in no way committed the World Zionist Organization.

LEADERS REPORTED UPSET

It was understood that Premier Levi Eshkol and Foreign Minister Golda Meir and their associates were also upset over the Zionist leader's comments that accusations against the Soviet Union's treatment of its Jews were often distorted.

A Jewish agency official bemoaned the fact that “the good relations that we had built up” between the agency and key Government ministries on foreign policy questions had received a setback with Dr. Goldmann's statements.

However, this was not the first time that Dr. Goldmann has been at odds with Israel's leaders over a foreign policy question. When David Ben-Gurion was Premier the two men frequently and publicly disagreed. Under the Eshkol regime these frictions have been reduced.

Four of the five Israeli newspapers that devoted editorials today to Dr. Goldmann's New York statements took him to task. The only paper that supported his advocacy of “quiet diplomatic action” was the organ of the ultra-orthodox religious political party Agudat Israel.

One paper called his statements “most surprising and in part damaging and harmful.” Another asked if “it was necessary to put a weapon into our enemies' hands by declaring that unjust accusations are being leveled against Russia.”

A third asserted that “we cannot understand why at this particular time when the Jewish organizations in the United States—largely against the will of the State Department—have come out into the open to win over public opinion Dr. Goldmann comes along to stick a spoke in the wheel.”

The fourth critical newspaper held that “coming in the wake of President Johnson's recent public appeal to the Soviet Government in behalf of Russian Jewry, Dr. Goldmann's statements clearly were unfortunate in their timing.”

In its campaign to arouse world opinion and Jewish opinion in particular to the restrictions placed on Russian Jews the Israeli Government has always emphasized the right of Soviet Jewry to emigrate freely to Israel.

Close observers of the Israeli scene believe this emphasis reflects the desire of this country's authorities to offset the rapidly expanding backward and poorly educated Oriental Jewish communities with more progressive and better educated Jews from the West and from the Soviet Union.

WATERGATE CONCERT SHELL

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, on this day of the Festival of Arts at the White House, it seems particularly appropriate to introduce a bill for the construction of a new shell for the Watergate and other concerts on the Potomac.

As a former staff employee of the late Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming, I am a Watergate concert fan of long standing, and as a member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I share the concern regarding the deterioration of the present facility.

If Washington is to remain a fitting Capitol for this great Nation, it seems imperative that we not let the Watergate tradition die. In behalf of all who are interested in a more beautiful Washington, I am happy to introduce the following bill:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Secretary of the Interior, a sum not exceeding \$342,500 to construct a new and larger concert shell, with either a barge or piling foundation, for the Watergate and other concerts in Washington, D.C.

LAND ACQUISITION POLICIES SHOULD CHANGE

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise once again to protest the land acquisition policies of the Army Corps of Engineers. The so-called negotiation policy is one which should receive a complete and immediate review. It is a policy which is doing more to create distrust of the Federal Government in certain areas of the country than anything I know. The citizen is never told what the Government's appraisal is. If he is shrewd in the ways of business, he will avoid taking the first offer. He will argue and resist and the Government will gradually come up and they might get together. But those who deserve the most protection get the least protection under this policy. The old and tired, the inexperienced in business affairs, the weak and gullible—all are taken advantage of by this policy. And then, too, Mr. Speaker, in my area of Indiana, the Government has been stingy

and reluctant in their offers. In certain instances I feel quite sure that the Government will get trounced in the courts by those whose determination has taken them into the courts. Appraisals are in the hands of affected property owners giving values twice as high as that the Government has offered. These are appraisals by competent local appraisers who know better than any outsider the value of lands being bought and sold in the area. It bothers me to know that these people are taken advantage of but most of all I am disturbed by the fact these highhanded tactics are creating such bitter and resentful feelings against the Federal Government. It is understandable that the people being displaced are disturbed and distressed because the Government is interfering with their lives and in some instances their livelihood but when it is all done they should at the least have respect for the Government and its processes and be able to say, "The Government treated me fairly."

IMPROVEMENT IN OUR LABOR LAWS

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a package of five labor bills which anticipates the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act and provides for appropriate improvement in labor laws to further safeguard the public interest and bolster union democracy.

Four of these measures are designed to strengthen the collective bargaining process; provide for a secret ballot in union representation cases; further equal employment opportunities and improve machinery to deal with national emergency strikes. The fifth bill would increase the minimum wage under the Fair Labor Standards Act from \$1.25 to \$1.50 per hour.

Parallel measures are being introduced in the other body by my distinguished colleague, Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, ranking Republican on the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

I have long been on record against proposals which seek to abolish or diminish labor's right to self-organization and collective action. Unions have largely been a force for good in our society. But no objective person can fail to recognize the need for keeping union responsibility abreast of union authority.

Mr. Speaker, the first of the bills I am introducing today would amend the Labor-Management Relations Act to give the Federal courts jurisdiction to enforce provisions of collective bargaining agreements containing no-strike, no-lockout clauses, provided that such jurisdiction is specifically accepted in the contract and the contract contains a clause providing for the arbitration of disputes. The Supreme Court has held that the Federal courts are deprived of jurisdiction to enforce no-strike clauses regard-

less of what the parties themselves have negotiated.

The second bill amends the National Labor Relations Act to insure, when requested, a secret ballot election in union representation cases in lieu of a card check.

The third bill would amend the Equal Employment Opportunity title, title VII, of the 1964 Civil Rights Act to improve its coverage of unions and employers, to strengthen the enforcement and investigatory powers of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission—similar to New York State's Commission on Human Rights—and to stress equal opportunity access to apprenticeship and other training programs.

Testimony before the House Education and Labor Committee still indicates that only about 2 percent of those engaged in apprenticeship training programs throughout the United States are Negro. Further, Negro unemployment rates are at least double those of others; and the Commission should be given the power to issue cease and desist orders, go to court, and deal more urgently with the opportunities of apprenticeship training for those who are qualified.

The fourth bill would give the President new powers to protect the public health and safety in national emergency strike situation. The powers would include appointment of a board of inquiry to make public recommendations for a settlement, a 30-day freeze during which both parties would be required to bargain on the recommendations but neither party would be required to accept them, and authority for the President to seek in Federal Court the appointment of a receiver to operate struck facilities to the extent necessary to protect the national health and safety.

Mr. Speaker, it is increasingly clear that the Nation cannot sustain crippling and grave national emergency strikes resulting in massive layoffs and serious disruption of the economy. This legislation would certainly enhance the powers of the bargaining table and require—for at least 30 days—the parties to the dispute to bargain within the framework of responsible recommendations.

The final bill would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to increase the minimum wage of \$1.25 to \$1.50 per hour. The present minimum wage of \$1.25 provides a wage below that which is considered minimal in the Economic Opportunity Act and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I believe that it is far better for the free enterprise system to provide a living wage than the Federal Government to institute make-work programs.

REVISION OF COPYRIGHT LAWS

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, a bill is presently pending in the Judiciary Committee of this body to provide for revision of our copyright laws. As one whose district includes the home of Samuel Clemens, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Jimmy Lunceford, as well as many other artists and authors of considerable reputation, I am intensely concerned with this problem.

Therefore, I should like to introduce into the RECORD at this point an article from *Variety*, by a close friend and well-known New York attorney, Richard Wincor, which I think delineates the rough edges of this dilemma.

[From *Variety*]

A PROPOSAL TO ABOLISH COPYRIGHT

(By Piraticus)

At a time when American education is undergoing its most severe test in the world leadership syndrome, a small but monopolistic group of authors is agitating for an extension of copyright. The socioeconomic implications of this phenomenon menace scholarship itself.

Accordingly, I propose that universities, foundations, libraries, motion picture companies and others dedicated to the advancement of learning unite in sponsoring a bill in Congress to abolish copyright.

American youth must not be taxed for the privilege of learning from great books through new photo-duplicating processes or great shows available now through educational television. In a democracy these things must be free to all, unfettered by the dead hand of monopoly. Copyright means paying royalties; this constitutes a thrust at the heart of the intellectual community.

Authors are very quick to cry private property but they are known as a group to include many unfortunate persons sympathetic to or duped by atheistic communism. Many of them, moreover, are persons of questionable morals who consort with actors.

Private property will be recognized by any Freudian as a mask for greed impelled by an insecurity syndrome and guilt feelings. This perplex, on a gestalt basis, is *sui generis*. True authors write for the advancement of learning and to enrich human values. Acceptance and popularity should be their own rewards; people who want money can get plenty of foundation grants, or even go into business or one of the professions.

Must an American child pay Shakespeare's family for the right to read "Hamlet"? One shudders at this notion; yet the enemies of culture demand payment for the works of Rex Stout and Elizabeth Janeway. Nothing could be further from the spirit of intellectual liberty and the free exchange of ideas.

Authors like to draw false analogies between their scribbles and other forms of property. One celebrated writer, whose lack of the ability to relate and fragmented orientation generally make his views suspect, exemplifies this gaucherie. He suggested (seriously, I think) that because manufacturers of hockey sticks are paid for the sale of their products to schools and universities, the author should be similarly treated. He mentioned, too, payment by libraries for their mops and pails.

Hockey sticks indeed. Mops and pails, to be sure. The analogy affronts intelligence. Making hockey sticks requires skill; mops and pails are useful things in any library. The writings of an author comprise a nexus of intangibles; they come within a different category. Anybody can write.

For that matter, atheistic communism is rampant in hockey-stick circles and many mop and pail manufacturers are known

deviates. It may be that in time they too may be requested to surrender their monopolistic practice of exacting payment. Whether the public welfare requires it must be the test.

For the time being, however, authors are the main obstruction to a free society. Abolish copyright and the true artists will go on writing anyway. This is a time to separate the wheat from the goats.

It may be argued that this whole proposal is unrealistic, and it may well be so, in view of the power of author's lobbies in world capitals. As a compromise I would suggest a copyright term limited to 1 year. If the author has anything worthwhile he can "clean up" in that period. Thereafter his writings ought to be free as the air we breathe, without taxes, without levies, without conditions, without restrictions, without anything that impedes drinking deep from the cup of knowledge.

Only in this way can we maintain intellectual leadership. Only by abolishing copyright entirely can we expose future generations to the best things, and save writers from false values and the depraved blandishments of a materialistic society. (© 1965 Piraticus; all rights reserved; no portion of this article may be reproduced anywhere by anyone without the written permission of the copyright owner.)

POLITICAL CATAclysm DESIGNED BY THE SUPREME COURT—ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE RICHARD DeCOSTER IN THE MISSOURI GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House of Representatives to the remarks of the distinguished member of the Missouri General Assembly, Representative Richard DeCoster of Lewis County, Mo., which I think aptly describes the political cataclysm the Supreme Court has designed for us.

ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE RICHARD DeCOSTER IN THE MISSOURI GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. Speaker, this may be, it is in fact, the beginning of the end for a large number of us here. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that you and our colleagues bear with me for just a few minutes in this monologue in futility.

Mr. Speaker, I am genuinely alarmed at my own realization of the futility of the remarks I am about to make. But I shall make them, Mr. Speaker, because I believe every citizen of Missouri should be awakened and likewise alarmed. And further because, Mr. Speaker, I want no member of this assembly to be able to say in future years, "I didn't realize what we were doing" or to say, "I had no idea it could lead to this."

And, Mr. Speaker, because a task may seem insurmountable, does not necessarily mean that it is impossible. And, even if impossible, this is no excuse for us to surrender without a fight, where the stakes are life or death. In all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, it is my fearful belief that we may today be taking a turn down the road of destruction for Missouri's Representative Assembly.

This Republic and its unique form of representative democracy was founded, nourished, sustained, and has endured on basic

principles of checks and balances so well understood by every American as to need no elucidation here. At various times through our history our people have been alerted to the fact that these checks and balances have been endangered, and that attempts have been made to throw the system out of balance.

Always our people, and usually the other two branches of the Government, have reacted promptly and with definitude to prevent any one branch from exceeding its traditional and constitutional limitation. Likewise it has been the branch upon whose prerogatives encroachments are threatened, that has been first to sound the warning and lead the charge in its own defense. Today, I am utterly bewildered by the apparent apathy—even reluctance, of Federal and State legislative branches and of our people themselves to recognize and rise up and defend against the usurpation of legislative powers by the judicial branch of our Government.

A few discriminating, alert and courageous men like yourself, Mr. Speaker, and our former Speaker, Congressman ICHORN, have tried dramatically to awaken our people to what is happening. But your dramatic charges and pronouncements, instead of having their intended effect, have produced public criticism and personal ridicule. This, of course, is not without precedent in the lives of patriots of our past.

Today, Mr. Speaker, at this hour, we are about to send to the State Senate of Missouri a plan for the reapportionment of our own districts. The plan which we now offer is a radical departure from the principle upon which the apportionment of the legislative body closest to the people in all of the States of the Union, historically have been based. I shall vote for this plan today with mixed emotions.

First, I am proud that we have proven to the skeptics, especially those in the judicial and executive branches, that we, as a responsible and capable legislative body can face up to the onerous and highly distasteful task of reapportioning ourselves. In doing this we have taken a significant stand to uphold the integrity of the legislative branch of the Government, and have stanchly refused to surrender more of our legislative responsibilities to the executive branch. Come what may, Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope, indeed, my fervent prayer, that this house shall never call upon or voluntarily permit the executive or judiciary to draw the lines and choose the territories within which our people shall join together to select their policymaking—their lawmaking—their tax-levying representatives.

Yet, with all my heart, with my deepest convictions, I want to vote against this bill, as I want to vote against any bill that fails to take into consideration distances and other geographical, economical and social factors that I believe are essential ingredients of fair and equal representative democracy. (And if I may digress, I should like to point out that should the Representative from my new district reside in the most populous town in the district, 90 percent of the people would have to pay a toll to even telephone their Representative. If he comes from any other place in the district, the percentage would be higher. And may I ask, Does anyone here seriously contend that the 26,000 people of the large outstate districts will, under this plan, have equal representation with those 26,000 living within a district composed of a few blocks or of a single county?)

When I was a boy on the farm, we all liked fried chicken and baked hen. But like most other good things in life, there was a drawback—someone had to cut the head off of the chicken. Well anyway, the tastiness of the chicken had to outweigh the distastefulness of the beheading. We had no choice.

If we wanted to eat chicken, someone had to cut the head off.

I cannot help but reflect upon the analogy with the situation which I have found myself faced this session. As I have indicated, and as you know, I am a devoted disciple of the school that believes that the apportionment of the legislature is exclusively a legislative function. It is not a proper function of the courts as demonstrated in Oklahoma and as is threatened by some of us here today; it is not a function of the executive as has been advocated to us, and as is indeed practiced in what was once called the upper house of this State.

If then, I am to enjoy the luxury of standing for this conviction, that apportionment is a legislative responsibility, and for my further conviction that legislatures are strengthened by facing and accepting their responsibilities, and that they are weakened by abdicating and retreating from them, then I must accept the responsibility of earnestly working out a plan of reapportionment that will forestall the courts from doing it for me. This I have attempted to do. Many members have worked long, hard, and painstakingly at this job, but none more than I.

But—I want to know, Mr. Speaker, I want the members of this house to know—I want the people of the State of Missouri to know, that I did not do it willingly or freely, but that I did it under the implied threat and coercion of the Federal courts of these United States. In reapportioning the Missouri House of Representatives, I certainly am not exercising the wishes of the majority of the people of my county, nor of my area. This is not to say that I am opposed to reapportionment. I wish it clearly understood that I recognize periodic reapportionment as both necessary and desirable. But—I do not believe the courts should decree reapportionment until the legislature has failed and refused. To my knowledge this legislature has not had a reapportionment amendment even offered, much less turned down. This is some indication that those bringing the suit hold their legislature in such contempt as to completely bypass it. May it be true that these kind of people would just as soon see no legislature at all? And I do not believe that equal vote is synonymous with equal representation.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to vote against this bill (although I worked hard to perfect it. And I will say that if such a bill must be passed, this is as good as we can expect to do, and a whole lot better than a court or Governor's committee could be expected to do).

I want to vote against the bill as a vote of protest, a futile act of defiance if you will, against the courts that have usurped the legislative authority by the power of the positions which they hold.

Mr. Speaker, to those from the populous areas I would say—today—insofar as representative government is concerned—today—my people die that yours may live. It is my prayer that they shall so live that we shall not have died in vain. For I fear, that just like the fried chicken—where now no one even thinks about the beheading—our people may come to care less about how or who, if anyone, is representing them, as long as the chicken is there.

I was going to close by saying that rural legislators do not die, they just dwindle away. But they do die, Mr. Speaker. They die today, and in 1971, and in every 10 years thereafter. They die at the hands of the narrowly blinded lord high executioners. I have helped to prepare the graves Mr. Speaker. Now I must be a party to filling them. Today we inter the victims of a misguided judiciary, and with them the rights and the confidence of thousands of now skeptical Missourians.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, earlier last week I was unavoidably absent from this Chamber to attend the graduation exercises at the U.S. Air Force Academy of which our State is very proud.

Had I been present I would have voted for the appropriations for the legislative branch for fiscal year 1966, H.R. 8775. Also I would have voted for H.R. 7105 to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports.

Had I been here Wednesday, I would have supported passage of H.R. 8464 to permit a temporary increase in the public debt limit, and House Concurrent Resolution 285 to allow the showing in the United States of the U.S. Information Agency film "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums."

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS AT HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, recently President Johnson delivered the commencement address at Howard University. I feel sure that this speech will come to be regarded in history as one of the greatest statements ever made by a President of the United States about the desperate struggle of Negro Americans to achieve their rightful place in American society. With the moving eloquence of a great leader, President Johnson made it crystal clear that the voting rights bill of 1965—soon to come before the House and soon to become the law of the land—is not the end of the struggle for equal rights. In fact it is not even the beginning of the end, but really just the end of the beginning.

The President reminded us that the vote is only a means to an end—the guarantee of justice and dignity for every American. But as hard as we are working in the war on poverty, aid to education, and for all the other increased community services to the needy citizens of this country, we are still far from achieving the American dream of equality for all men. The unemployment rate for Negro workers is increasing and particularly with regard to Negro youth. Segregation in urban housing is increasing, and the median income of Negro Americans is falling behind the overall rise in income. These statistics and many others all point to one inescapable conclusion—even though both Negro and white Americans are benefiting from an

increased standard of living, Negro Americans are steadily losing, not gaining ground, in the struggle to achieve true equality.

And why? The various explanations can be traced back in the past to the devastating effects of the legacy of slavery and in the present to the black ghettos in the cities of America from which only a relatively few ever escape. As President Johnson stated, Negro Americans in the ghettos are in another world—a hopeless world.

President Johnson analyzed the plight of black America in a straightforward and moving way. I urge upon my colleagues to join in his call for action for these reasons.

I sincerely commend this magnificent address to the attention of every Member of the House and ask that it be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

[From the Washington Post, June 5, 1965]
PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS AT HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Our earth is the home of revolution.

In every corner of every continent men charged with hope contend with ancient ways in pursuit of justice. They reach for the newest of weapons to realize the oldest of dreams: that each may walk in freedom and pride, stretching his talents, enjoying the fruits of the earth.

Our enemies may occasionally seize the day of change. But it is the banner of our revolution they take. And our own failure is linked to this process of swift and turbulent change in many lands. But nothing, in any country, touches us more profoundly, nothing is more freighted with meaning for our own destiny, than the revolution of the Negro American.

In far too many ways American Negroes have been another nation: deprived of freedom, crippled by hatred, the doors of opportunity closed to hope.

In our time change has come to this Nation, too. Heroically, the American Negro—acting with impressive restraint—has peacefully protested and marched, entered the courtrooms and the seats of government, demanding a justice long denied. The voice of the Negro was the call to action. But it is a tribute to America that, once aroused, the courts and the Congress, the President and most of the people, have been the allies of progress. Thus we have seen the high court of the country declare that discrimination based on race was repugnant to the Constitution, and therefore void. We have seen—in 1957, 1960, and again in 1964—the first civil rights legislation in almost a century.

As majority leader I helped guide two of these bills through the Senate. And, as your President, I was proud to sign the third.

And soon we will have the fourth new law, guaranteeing every American the right to vote.

No act of my administration will give me greater satisfaction than the day when my signature makes this bill too the law of the land.

The voting rights bill will be the latest, and among the most important, in a long series of victories. But this victory—as Winston Churchill said of another triumph for freedom—"is not the end. It is not even the beginning of the end. But it is, perhaps, the end of the beginning."

That beginning is freedom; and the barriers to that freedom are tumbling. Freedom is the right to share, fully and equally, in American society—to vote, to hold a job, to enter a public place, to go to school. It is

the right to be treated, in every part of our national life, as a man equal in dignity and promise to all others.

FREEDOM NOT ENOUGH

But freedom is not enough. You do not wipe away the scars of centuries by saying: Now, you are free to go where you want, do as you desire, and choose the leaders you please.

You do not take a man who, for years, has been hobbled by chains, liberate him, bring him to the starting line of a race, saying "you are free to compete with all the others," and still justly believe you have been completely fair. Thus it is not enough to open the gates of opportunity. All our citizens must have the ability to walk through those gates.

This is the next and the more profound stage of the battle for civil rights. We seek not just freedom but opportunity—not just legal equity but human ability—not just equality as a right and a theory, but equality as a fact and a result.

Thus the task is to give 20 million Negroes the same chance as every other American to learn and grow—to work and share in society—to develop their abilities—physical, mental, and spiritual, and to pursue their individual happiness.

To this end equal opportunity is essential, but not enough. Men and women of all races are born with the same range of abilities. But ability is not just the product of birth. It is stretched or stunted by the family you live with, and the neighborhood you live in—by the school you go to, and the poverty or richness of your surroundings. It is the product of a hundred unseen forces, all playing upon the infant, the child, and the man.

This graduating class at Howard University is witness to the indomitable determination of the Negro American to win his way in American life.

The number of Negroes in schools of high learning has almost doubled in 15 years. The number of nonwhite professional workers has more than doubled in 10 years. The median income of Negro college women now exceeds that of white college women. And these are the enormous accomplishments of distinguished individual Negroes, many of them graduates of this institution.

These are proud and impressive achievements. But they only tell the story of a growing middle class minority, steadily narrowing the gap between them and their white counterparts.

But for the great majority of Negro Americans—the poor, the unemployed, the uprooted and dispossessed—there is a grimmer story. They still are another nation. Despite the court orders and the laws, the victories and speeches, for them the walls are rising and the gulf is widening.

THE FACTS OF FAILURE

Here are some of the facts of this American failure.

Thirty-five years ago the rate of unemployment for Negroes and whites was about the same. Today the Negro rate is twice as high.

In 1948 the 8 percent unemployment rate for Negro teenage boys was actually less than that of whites. By last year it had grown to 23 percent, as against 13 percent for whites.

Between 1949 and 1959, the income of Negro men relative to white men declined in every section of the country. From 1952 to 1963 the median income of Negro families compared to white actually dropped from 57 percent to 53 percent.

In the years 1955–57, 22 percent of experienced Negro workers were out of work at some time during the year. In 1961–63 that proportion had soared to 29 percent.

Since 1947 the number of white families living in poverty has decreased 27 percent

while the number of poor nonwhite families went down only 3 percent.

The infant mortality of nonwhites in 1940 was 70 percent greater than whites. Twenty-two years later it was 90 percent greater.

Moreover, the isolation of Negro from white communities is increasing, rather than diminishing as Negroes crowd into the central cities—becoming a city within a city.

Of course Negro Americans as well as white Americans have shared in our rising national abundance. But the harsh fact of the matter is that in the battle for true equality too many are losing ground.

We are not completely sure why this is. The causes are complex and subtle. But we do know the two broad basic reasons. And we know we have to act.

First, Negroes are trapped—as many whites are trapped—in inherited, gateless poverty. They lack training and skills. They are shut in slums, without decent medical care. Private and public poverty combine to cripple their capacities.

We are attacking these evils through our poverty program, our education program, our health program, and a dozen more—aimed at the root causes of poverty.

We will increase, and accelerate, and broaden this attack in years to come, until this most enduring of foes yields to our unyielding will.

PREJUDICE MUST BE FOUGHT

But there is a second cause—more difficult to explain, more deeply grounded, more desperate in its force. It is the devastating heritage of long years of slavery, and a century of oppression, hatred, and injustice.

For Negro poverty is not white poverty. Many of its causes and many of its cures are the same. But there are differences—deep, corrosive, obstinate differences—radiating painful roots into the community, the family, and the nature of the individual.

These differences are not racial differences, they are solely and simply the consequence of ancient brutality, past injustice, and present prejudice. They are anguishing to observe. For the Negro they are a reminder of oppression. For the white they are a reminder of guilt. But they must be faced, and dealt with, and overcome, if we are to reach the time when the only difference between Negroes and whites is the color of their skin.

Nor can we find a complete answer in the experience of other American minorities. They made a valiant, and largely successful effort to emerge from poverty and prejudice. The Negro, like these others, will have to rely mostly on his own efforts. But he cannot do it alone. For they did not have the heritage of centuries to overcome. They did not have a cultural tradition which had been twisted and battered by endless years of hatred and hopelessness. Nor were they excluded because of race or color—a feeling whose dark intensity is matched by no other prejudice in our society.

Nor can these differences be understood as isolated infirmities. They are a seamless web. They cause each other. They result from each other. They reinforce each other. Much of the Negro community is buried under a blanket of history and circumstance. It is not a lasting solution to lift just one corner. We must stand on all sides and raise the entire cover if we are to liberate our fellow citizens.

One of the differences is the increased concentration of Negroes in our cities. More than 73 percent of all Negroes live in urban areas compared with less than 70 percent of whites. Most of them live in slums. And most of them live together; a separated people. Men are shaped by their world. When it is a world of decay ringed by an invisible wall—when escape is arduous and un-

certain, and the saving pressures of a more hopeful society are unknown—it can cripple the youth and desolate the man.

There is also the burden a dark skin can add to the search for a productive place in society. Unemployment strikes most swiftly and broadly at the Negro. This burden erodes hope. Blighted hope breeds despair. Despair brings indifference to the learning which offers a way out. And despair coupled with indifference is often the source of destructive rebellion against the fabric of society.

There is also the lacerating hurt of early collision with white hatred or prejudice, distaste or condescension. Other groups have felt similar intolerance. But success and achievement could wipe it away. They do not change the color of a man's skin. I have seen this uncomprehending pain in the eyes of young Mexican-American schoolchildren. It can be overcome. But, for many, the wounds are always open.

Perhaps most important—its influence radiating to every part of life—is the breakdown on the Negro family structure. For this, most of all, white America must accept responsibility. It flows from centuries of oppression and persecution of the Negro man. It flows from the long years of degradation and discrimination which have attacked his dignity and assaulted his ability to provide for his family.

This, too, is not pleasant to look upon. But it must be faced by those whose serious intent is to improve the life of all Americans.

Only a minority—less than half—of all Negro children reach the age of 18 having lived all their lives with both parents. At this moment, today, little less than two-thirds are living with both parents. Probably a majority of all Negro children receive federally aided public assistance during their childhood.

The family is the cornerstone of our society. More than any other force it shapes the attitude, the hopes, the ambitions, and the values of the child. When the family collapses the child is usually damaged. When it happens on a massive scale the community itself is crippled.

Unless we work to strengthen the family—to create conditions under which most parents will stay together—all the rest: schools and playgrounds, public assistance and private concern—will not be enough to cut completely the circle of despair and deprivation.

NO EASY ANSWER

There is no single easy answer to all these problems.

Jobs are part of the answer. They bring the income which permits a man to provide for his family.

Decent homes in decent surroundings and a chance to learn are part of the answer.

Welfare and social programs better designed to hold families together are part of the answer.

Care for the sick is part of the answer. An understanding heart by all Americans is also part of the answer.

To all these fronts—and a dozen more—I will dedicate the expanding efforts of my administration.

But there are other answers still to be found. Nor do we fully understand all the problems. Therefore, this fall, I intend to call a White House conference of scholars, experts, Negro leaders, and officials at every level of government.

Its theme and title: "To Fulfill These Rights."

Its object: to help the American Negro fulfill the rights which—after the long time of injustice—he is finally about to secure.

To move beyond opportunity to achievement.

To shatter forever, not only the barriers of law and public practice, but the walls which bound the condition of man by the color of his skin.

To dissolve, as best we can, the antique enmities of the heart which diminish the holder, divide the great democracy, and do wrong to the children of God.

I pledge this will be a chief goal of my administration, and of my program next year, and in years to come.

I hope it will be part of the program of all America.

For what is justice?

It is to fulfill the fair expectations of man.

Thus, American justice is a very special thing. For, from the first, this has been a land of towering expectations. It was to be a Nation where each man would be ruled by the common consent of all—enshrined in law, given life by institutions, guided by men themselves subject to its rule. And all—of every station and origin—would be touched equally in obligation and in liberty.

Beyond the law lay the land. It was a rich land, glowing with more abundant promise than ever man had seen. Here, unlike any place yet known, all were to share the harvest.

And beyond this was the dignity of man. Each could become whatever his qualities of mind and spirit would permit—to strive, to seek, and, if he could, to find his happiness.

This is American justice. We have pursued it faithfully to the edge of our imperfections. And we have failed to find it for the American Negro.

It is the glorious opportunity of this generation to end the one huge wrong of the American Nation—and in so doing to find America for ourselves, with the same immense thrill of discovery which gripped those who first began to realize that here, at last, was a home for freedom.

All it will take is for all of us to understand what this country is and what it must become.

The Scripture promises: "I shall light a candle of understanding in thine heart, which shall not be put out."

Together, and with millions more, we can light that candle of understanding in the heart of America.

And, once lit, it will never again go out.

WATER QUALITY ACT

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, the Senate passed a Water Quality Act on January 28. The House passed a Water Quality Act on April 28. The two versions of the legislation differ, but this is nothing unusual. What is unusual is that the Senate, whose turn is next, has gone this long without indicating whether it accepts the House version or whether it wants a joint conference to work out the differences.

I believe the House bill is an excellent one. Acceptance of it would do credit to the Senate. However, we in the House are not so arrogant as to think that our bill is sacrosanct. The experience of 176 years of free debate in this great Congress has taught us that reasonable men, coming together from the two

Houses, can produce a third version eminently satisfactory to both and suitable to the needs of the Nation.

If there is a sense of urgency in my remarks, it is because I am more and more impressed, as each day goes by, that we are not doing enough to halt pollution of our streams and rivers. We have the desire to halt it. Our States and local communities have the desire to halt it. All they need, in the final analysis, is the financial wherewithal.

Mr. Speaker, we are not going to get very much pure water by promulgating pollution standards, or by standing in the road of progress, or by sitting on the riverbank counting the bacteria floating by. The job of cleaning up our rivers and streams is going to be accomplished by building treatment and disposal works to divert, cleanse, and properly dispose of waste matter. The outstanding virtue of the House bill is that, for fiscal years starting July 1—less than a month away—it increases by 50 percent the amount of money available to the States and local communities for just that purpose. I say let us get the show on the road.

THE LATE HONORABLE BERNARD J. MORAN

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, the State of Illinois and the 19th District, which I represent, were greatly saddened by the death of Mr. Bernard J. Moran, Democratic committeeman for the 19th Congressional District. "Barney" Moran was my close friend and I deeply feel his loss.

He was a lawyer in the finest tradition. Educated at St. Ambrose College, Davenport, Iowa, and Georgetown University Law School, he served as associate editor of the Georgetown Law Review. He studied also at the University of Illinois and the University of Michigan.

He began his law career as a legal secretary to Justice Loren E. Murphy of the Illinois Supreme Court and then moved to his childhood home of Rock Island where he founded the law firm of Moran, Klockau, McCarthy, Schubert & Lousberg.

Barney Moran was a faithful member of the Democratic Party. In 1948 he defeated a four-term incumbent for the Democratic nomination for State's attorney. He went on to defeat the Republican nominee and compiled the largest majority for a county office since the early 1930's. He was renominated to the State's attorney's post and in 1952 was the leading Democratic candidate on the ticket. He won reelection again in 1956.

That same year he gained national attention because of his painstaking investigation which led to the release of Mr.

Roy E. Eaton, who had served 16 years on a kidnap-robbery conviction. The climactic testimony of two men who admitted participation in the crime exonerated Eaton. The Illinois Legislature appropriated \$48,000 as compensation for Mr. Eaton's time spent in prison. The case was the subject of a national television program.

Although he had retired from holding public office himself, Barney Moran continued to work hard on behalf of Democratic candidates. I was grateful for his guidance and untiring efforts during my campaign.

I would like at this time to insert the resolution introduced by the Honorable Paul J. Rink, State representative from Rock Island, Ill., as he paid tribute to Barney Moran on behalf of the Illinois State Legislature, and in doing so express my grief at the loss of this outstanding American.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 196

Whereas in the inscrutable designs of the Almighty, death came to Bernard Moran, Democratic committeeman for the 19th Illinois Congressional District, and his son, Terry, in the crash of their plane en route to Indianapolis, Ind.; and

Whereas Bernard Moran during his lifetime was a devoted servant of humanity possessing unusual qualities of leadership and was a recognized leader of the bar; and

Whereas in his humble desire to serve the people of his community and the State, Bernard Moran served three terms as State's attorney of Rock Island County from 1948 to 1960, during which he became well known for his prosecutions of the horsemeat scandals and pinball cases; he was president of the Illinois Association of State's Attorneys in 1957, and in 1961 was named a special assistant to the attorney general in addition to the duties of his law practice and the insurance company he headed; and

Whereas the dignity of conduct, and integrity of principle which characterized his entire professional and private life merited the undying esteem and admiration of all who were privileged to associate with him: Therefore, be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the 74th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we express our profound sorrow at the death of this eminent lawyer and citizen, Bernard Moran, and his young son; that to his bereaved family we extend our heartfelt sympathy, and that a suitable copy of this resolution be forwarded to Ellynor Moran, widow of the deceased.

A LITTLE UNITED NATIONS—IMPORTANCE OF CREDIT UNIONS IN WORLD AFFAIRS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, last month in San Francisco, I was privileged to attend the 31st annual meeting of CUNA International, Inc., the worldwide association of credit unions. I was honored to deliver the major convention address and to become the second individual in history to receive

CUNA International's Distinguished Service Award.

I wish to reflect not on my remarks to the convention nor on the award I received, but on an event at which I was a mere bystander. I refer to the opening ceremony of the CUNA International Board of Directors annual meeting May 14.

What I witnessed was a session that to me represented a "little United Nations." But where discord and antipathy are often characteristic of United Nations meetings in New York, the tenor of CUNA International's little United Nations session was one of harmony and cooperative self-help. I am sure that all of the more than 250 directors and the many delegates and guests attending the session would agree with me.

At the outset—with everyone on the convention floor standing in respect to the nationalities represented—the colors of all nations whose credit unions have banded together in leagues affiliated with CUNA International were presented to the convention. I think you can imagine the beauty and splendor I watched and the awe I experienced as the Travis Sabres, the drill team of Travis Air Force Base, trooped forward to the accompaniment of each country's national anthem and placed a flag before us.

The nations so honored were the United States, Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Columbia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Ireland, Jamaica, Korea, the Netherlands Antilles, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, Tanzania, Trinidad, and Tobago, part of the West Indies Confederation, the Fiji Islands, British Honduras, and Venezuela.

So often expressing the virtues of freedom and peace, the words of these national anthems, in my mind, tend to reflect the way the credit union movement has proceeded at home and abroad—especially in recent years.

At home, credit unions have turned to the pockets of poverty—both independently and with the cooperation of the Office of Economic Opportunity—to bring the spirit of self-help to the individuals and families who need it most. To these people, credit unions have brought an appreciation of thrift through saving, a source of loans that can be obtained for provident and productive purposes at fair interest rates, and an outlet for consumer information that aims to improve buying habits. Credit unions, in short, have given these people an opportunity to grow out of poverty—not to be lifted out.

Abroad, credit unions providing the same kind of services have spread into more than 70 nations of the free world—including those honored at CUNA International's annual meetings for having affiliated credit union leagues representing many individual credit unions.

Much of CUNA International's overseas work has been done through cooperative programs with the Agency for International Development and the Peace Corps. The major emphasis has been in Latin America, where in the last 2½ years 250,000 new credit union members

brought the total credit union membership in that area to 400,000. But wherever you look in the free world, it seems the credit union movement is on the march—in Africa, in free Asia, in the Pacific. And the most important factor in this development is that the American presence and day-to-day influence is temporary. CUNA International representatives, at the request of a foreign government, move in to offer technical assistance in establishing and operating credit unions. Once the credit unions are on firm footing, these representatives move out, leaving the native countrymen to make the credit union idea work.

Does it work? Yes, indeed. In Latin America during the last 2½ years, for instance, credit union savings climbed from \$4.2 million to \$16.2 million as a result of investments made by people who earn an average yearly—yes, yearly—income of only \$80 to \$100. And because of the low interest rates on credit union loans, these people managed to boost their purchasing power by more than \$3.5 million in 1964 alone. All this happened without a single U.S. dollar being used to finance the start of an overseas credit union. Only the small cost of sustaining a CUNA International representative while he completes his technical assistance is involved.

With that kind of a performance record behind them and with greater plans before them, you can appreciate the pride the many CUNA International directors and delegates must have felt witnessing the presentation of colors, hearing the national anthems, and then listening to congratulatory messages from many United States and foreign dignitaries.

How the administration and officials of foreign governments appreciate the progress of what I term the "little United Nations," can best be summarized by a portion of President Johnson's message related to the board of directors of CUNA International during the ceremony. Said the President:

Few tasks are more important to our Nation and to the world than that of helping extend to the poor and the underprivileged their fair share of the world's abundance. Credit unions play a vital role in our efforts to accomplish this task. * * * And they are performing the same invaluable service for the needy abroad through the Peace Corps and the Agency for International Development. I extend my best wishes and my sincere hope that you continue to build upon your good work in every way you can and that our Nation and the world will always benefit from your responsible service.

Under unanimous consent, I include the full text of messages addressed to the CUNA International Board of Directors annual meeting in the RECORD. These consist of the President's message, plus those of the Vice President, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the President's Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs, the Agency for International Development's Assistant Administrator for Material Resources, the Prime Minister of Canada, and the Acting Prime Minister and Minister of Finance of Jamaica.

I also include excerpts of the national anthems of nations whose flags were presented to the convention be printed in the RECORD:

CONGRATULATORY MESSAGES TO CUNA INTERNATIONAL'S BOARD OF DIRECTORS ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 31ST ANNUAL MEETING, MAY 14, IN SAN FRANCISCO

REMARKS OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Few tasks are more important to our Nation and to the world than that of helping extend to the poor and the underprivileged their fair share of the world's abundance.

Credit unions play a vital role in our efforts to accomplish this task. In countless cities of our land they provide for people of little or modest means a way of saving at ample interest, as well as a source of loans at low interest. Under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, credit unions also serve as a powerful weapon in our war against poverty. And they are performing the same invaluable service for the needy abroad through the Peace Corps and the Agency for International Development.

To the board of directors of CUNA International, I extend my best wishes and my sincere hope that you continue to build upon your good work in every way you can and that our Nation and the world will always benefit from your responsible service.

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY

My congratulations and my best wishes for the success of your annual meeting and for continued great services.

REMARKS OF ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

I consider it a privilege to have this opportunity to send a message of greetings and good wishes on the occasion of your annual meeting.

Having been intimately associated with credit unions for a long time, I am well acquainted with the services volunteered by millions of devoted credit union leaders. I am proud to say that I am a member of the Agriculture Federal Credit Union in Washington, D.C., which serves employees of the Department of Agriculture around the world.

Although credit unions have grown phenomenally, the challenge of poverty, especially in rural area, points clearly to the need for still greater growth. According to the latest data available, less than one-half of 1 percent of the rural people in the United States belong to a credit union—yet rural people need these services fully as much as people in the cities.

Credit unions are springing up also in the less developed countries of the world, but here again the need far exceeds the services provided. It is with a sense of real urgency that I encourage you to extend the reach of this movement as rapidly as possible so as to make your services available throughout the United States and the entire free world.

REMARKS OF ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

I am pleased to send greetings to the members of the CUNA International on the occasion of your annual meeting. I share your pride in the accomplishments of credit unions in the United States, Canada, and throughout the free world.

Credit unions are both effective weapons against financial adversity and constructive tools for helping people achieve economic security.

My best wishes for a highly successful convention and for the continued progress of your important endeavor in the years ahead.

REMARKS OF MRS. ESTHER PETERSON, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR CONSUMER AFFAIRS

As the board of directors of CUNA International, Inc. convenes for the 31st annual

meeting of your association, I should like to extend my best wishes that your work be fruitful. My travels throughout the country have brought me in close contact with many good credit union members and I am sure some of them are with you in San Francisco. To them I send my warm regards; to the credit union members I have not yet had the pleasure of meeting I wish to express the hope that I shall have the opportunity to see you before long. I am especially pleased about the efforts of your association to bring benefits of credit unions including consumer education to persons of limited means in the U.S. Activities of credit unions and other consumer oriented groups are showing clearly that education in economic facts of life is a vital element in the War on Poverty. Please be assured that I am following your work with great interest.

REMARKS OF HERBERT J. WATERS, ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR FOR MATERIAL RESOURCES, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

CUNA is a success story of people working together. CUNA now represents more than 23 million people in 70 countries who have learned how to put many small savings to work so that together there are enough resources to do the big jobs. You have pioneered in helping others to help themselves through the principles of brotherhood, individual self-help, and democracy. You have helped implement cooperative savings among the small people of the world. AID is now working with CUNA to help millions of people overseas to organize more credit unions. You are to be congratulated not only on what you have done, but more importantly, on what you propose to do. May your deserved success continue.

REMARKS OF LESTER B. PEARSON, PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA

It is a pleasure indeed to extend cordial greetings on behalf of the Government of Canada to all participants in this year's CUNA International annual meeting in San Francisco.

I am pleased that Canadians are well represented in these international conferences of credit unions. I am also confident that they will contribute to your deliberations, as well as gaining significant guidance in furthering the welfare of the very large credit of credit unions. I am also confident that birthplace of the credit union movement in this hemisphere, Canada has a friendly interest in the expansion and growth of the benefits to be derived by underdeveloped countries through development of these self-help societies.

To credit union members everywhere, I extend my best wishes for continued progress and success.

REMARKS OF D. B. SANGSTER, ACTING PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF FINANCE, JAMAICA

On behalf of the 30,000 credit union members, and indeed of all Jamaica, I am very happy to send warmest greetings to the more than 1,000 credit union leaders representing over 70 countries, who will meet in San Francisco for the 31st annual meeting of the members and of the board of directors of the Credit Union International Association and similar meetings of its affiliates—CUNA Supply Cooperative and CUNA Mutual Insurance Society.

This year's meeting will be of special significance, since, for the first time, the 250-member board of directors, besides meeting together to discuss common problems, to receive reports and to elect officers for the ensuing year, will also meet in three separate forums to discuss problems which are peculiar to national representatives constituting the forum. This change has, no doubt, been dictated by the tremendous growth in membership and consequently in representa-

tion over the years. I feel sure that the forum meetings will prove quite profitable, particularly for members who are attending the meetings for the first time.

I have observed with a great deal of interest the major topics that will be up for discussion during the week. I know it will not be easy to find solutions or to get unanimity on how to attack the many problems confronting the credit union movement today. Share insurance and central banking facilities for credit unions, credit union development and expansion around the world, delinquency and stabilization programs for liquidating credit unions, legislative issues, member-education programs and other matters of interest to the credit union movement are not topics for which easy answers can be found. The most effective solution, however, will be found if delegates are prepared to enter their deliberations in the spirit of good will and cooperation, which should be so much in evidence when credit unionists get together to do business.

I wish you every success in the years that lie ahead.

EXCERPTS OF NATIONAL ANTHEMS OF NATIONS WHOSE FLAGS WERE PRESENTED TO CUNA INTERNATIONAL'S BOARD OF DIRECTORS ANNUAL MEETING MAY 14 IN SAN FRANCISCO

United States: "Oh, say, can you see by the dawn's early light what so proudly we hail."

Australia: "Let us rejoice, for we are young and free; we've golden soil and wealth for toil, our home is girt by sea."

Bolivia: "Here, where freedom, our freedom, is found * * * ever from bondage we celebrate release. After all the martial clamor that aspires to the clash of warfare's hideous insanity, now in contrast hear the music of humanity."

Brazil: "We with breasts bared defy, oh Freedom, death itself for the equality you taught us, striving fiercely here in your bosom to be worthy of this precious gift you brought us."

Canada: "May peace for ever be our lot, and plenteous store abound; and may those ties of love be ours, which discord cannot sever; and flourish green o'er freedom's home."

Colombia: "Oh unfading glory, oh immortal joy, in furrow of pain good is already germinating."

Costa Rica: "Noble country, the life of your people is revealed in the flag that you fly; for in peace, white and pure, they live tranquil 'neath the clear limpid blue of your sky."

Ecuador: "We salute e'er again this our homeland. Glory be to you, your radiance bestowing, who exceeding the sun, brightly shine."

Ireland: "Soldiers are we, whose lives are pledged to Ireland; some have come from a land beyond the wave. Sworn to be free, no more our ancient Ireland shall shelter the despot or the slave."

Jamaica: "Eternal Father * * * Teach us true respect for all, stir response to duty's call, strengthen us the weak to cherish, give us vision lest we perish."

Korea: "Tong-Hai Main and Pakdoo Mountain, though they may drain and wear, may God bless our land Korea for ever and ever."

Netherlands Antilles: "Among the nations our country is little known for the immense sea is there to hide it. Yet we love it above all nations. We sing its glory with all our heart."

Panama: "Home of progress, and blessed by endeavor, see, to measure of music sublime, at your feet roar two oceans, which sever, for your mission, away for all time."

Peru: "We are free; let us always be so and let the sun rather deny its light than that we should fall the solemn vow which our country raised to God."

The Philippines: "Ever within thy skies and through thy clouds and o'er thy hills and sea do we behold the radiance, feel the throb, of glorious liberty."

Tanzania (Tanganyika's anthem): "God bless Africa, bless its leaders. Let wisdom, unity, and peace be the shield of Africa and its people."

Trinidad and Tobago: "Side by side we stand, islands of the blue Caribbean Sea. This our native land, we pledge our lives to thee. Here ev'ry creed and race find an equal place."

United Kingdom (representing part of the West Indies Confederation, the Fiji Islands, and British Honduras): "God save the Queen: send her victorious, happy and glorious, long to reign over us."

Venezuela: "Glory to the nation which shook off the yoke, yet kept respect for honor, virtue and the law."

SMALL COMMUNITIES GETTING MANY FEDERAL AIDS AS PART OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT, SAYS REGIONAL ADMINISTRATOR W. W. COLLINS, OF FORT WORTH, TEX.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Housing and Home Finance Agency is one of the most effective organizations in the Government, and its Regional Administrator at Fort Worth, Mr. W. W. Collins, known throughout his eight-State area as Bill Collins, is one of the most effective employees in the Federal service. A typical product of his scholarly knowledge and sympathetic interest is the following article published in the May 1965 issue of *Journal of Housing*:

SMALL COMMUNITIES—GETTING MANY FEDERAL AIDS AS PART OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT

(By W. W. Collins, Regional Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Fort Worth, Tex.)

In his message on the cities delivered to the Congress March 2 this year, President Johnson recognized the magnitude of the growing population problems that urban areas will face in the next few years. With respect to small communities, he said, "We do not intend to forget or neglect those who live on the farms, in villages, and in small towns."

During the next few years, small communities will have unprecedented opportunities for healthy growth and orderly development. They can play a vital role in helping meet the need for good neighborhoods and communities that will be generated by the Nation's staggering population increase. They can be very effective in relieving the larger cities of some of the awesome burden that will be imposed by the requirements of an additional 30 million people in the next 15 years. But to take advantage of these opportunities, they must be willing to do their part in the development of good environments and suitable housing. President Johnson has clearly indicated that while the Federal Government can and will assist in many ways, the vast bulk of resources and energy, of talent and toil, will have to come from State and local governments, private interests, and individual citizens.

Many of the opportunities and problems resulting from our fast-growing population and the need for better living environments are similar for both large and small commu-

nities, differing only in magnitude. On the other hand, small communities have some opportunities and problems that larger places do not have. In order to get the maximum benefits from the population increase and to make the greatest contribution to the job of accommodating this increase, every community should give special attention to comprehensive planning, zoning and code enforcement, slum clearance, conservation and rehabilitation of neighborhoods, capital improvements with emphasis on basic public facilities, open space, beautification, suitable housing for all income groups, and proper coordination of all improvement and development efforts. Federal assistance offered through the Office of the Administrator and the constituents of the Housing and Home Finance Agency can be used by communities to minimize the problems that arise in carrying out these activities. All of these assistance programs are available to small communities, and some are especially designed for them.

SPECIAL SMALL COMMUNITY AIDS

Legislation providing for Federal assistance in connection with housing and urban development gives special consideration to those communities of less than 50,000 population. For example, in these "smaller communities," the Federal contribution is three-fourths of the net cost of an urban renewal project rather than two-thirds, as in the larger communities. Likewise, communities of under 50,000 population are eligible for long-term, low-interest-rate public facility loans through the Community Facilities Administration, whereas larger cities are not. The urban planning assistance program administered by the Urban Renewal Administration makes special provision for smaller communities. Places of less than 50,000 can obtain planning assistance from appropriate State planning agencies, with two-thirds of the cost being borne by a Federal grant.

There are many communities with far less than 50,000 population that are benefiting from HHFA programs. There is no statutory or administrative minimum population below which a community automatically is not eligible for assistance. But there must be reasonably good evidence that the assistance can and will be used to achieve the intended objective and that, in terms of this objective, it is a sound investment. For example, a public facility loan can be made only when there is good reason to believe that the facility is needed and that the loan can be repaid. Similarly, public housing assistance can be justified only when there are reliable indications of a long-term need for such housing by low-income families in the community and equally reliable indications of financial feasibility. Likewise, the Federal Government can participate in an urban renewal slum clearance project only if there is reasonable assurance that there will be a market for the cleared land.

ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS

In all three of these examples, it is obvious that the economic future of a community is a highly important factor. It is for this reason that population trends and projections are given so much weight in determining the feasibility of a public facility loan or a public housing project or an urban renewal project. Growth potential—or the absence of it—can be one of the serious problems that a small community has to face, even though the Federal assistance programs administered by HHFA and its constituents provide for various special considerations for economically distressed small places.

By and large, however, these programs are intended to help the small communities meet their problems resulting from growth rather than the problems resulting from economic deterioration. On the other hand,

properly used Federal assistance can often stimulate the economy of a small community and reverse a downward trend. Occasionally, calculated risks are justified in the administration of these programs, particularly if there are convincing indications that the community itself is determined to utilize its own resources to the maximum extent possible and to make a sincere effort to prove that the Federal assistance is a good investment.

Obviously, not all places classified as small communities have the same economic characteristics. For example, small communities that are in or near urbanized areas and those that are included in metropolitan areas have economic characteristics different from those that are more isolated. In the southwest, practically all metropolitan and urbanized areas are experiencing population increases ranging from moderate to dramatic and the smaller satellite communities are sharing in this growth. But not all of the isolated communities are growing. A recent study of 563 Texas communities with populations of less than 20,000 in 1950 and located outside of metropolitan areas revealed that less than one-half of those with populations under 2,500 showed a population increase in 1960, while 96 percent of those with populations between 10,000 and 20,000 experienced an increase.

The industrial, technical, and financial revolutions have moved many of the sources of employment and income from the rural areas and small communities to the larger places, taking with them people, particularly young people. The outlying small community now typically has a population of increasing median age and decreasing median income. One of the reasons for declining populations is the lack of employment opportunities.

Federal assistance programs, such as public housing, public facility loans, urban renewal, and home mortgage insurance, contribute to increased employment and income in small communities. The increased direct employment is often only for the duration of construction but the long-range benefits to the community include increased secondary employment and a permanent increase in the wealth of the community. HHFA programs are generally not sufficient within themselves to induce substantial economic growth but, coupled with the full local efforts, accomplishments can be dramatic. Many small communities have much to offer industry, particularly small industry.

WORKABLE PROGRAM

The workable program for community improvement, which is a statutory prerequisite for several types of Federal assistance for housing and urban development, can be especially helpful to small communities, since they generally have no other formal plan of action for the most effective use of all resources, private and public, to combat blight and to encourage orderly development. Many people whose primary interest has been the promotion of urban renewal, public housing, or FHA section 221(d) (3) moderate-income projects, without regard to how these projects might fit into total improvement programs, have been guilty of disservice to the communities by failing to emphasize the importance of a good workable program.

One of the most serious problems associated with HHFA programs is the refusal of promoter-type consultants and architects to accept workable program objectives and their failure to advise communities of the benefits that can be derived from working toward these objectives. This problem is especially troublesome in small communities, where local officials, who must ration their time between personal and public responsibilities, depend heavily upon the advice of consultants. The unfortunate result has been gross misunderstanding about the work-

able program, delays in housing and urban renewal projects, and poor coordination of community improvement efforts. Consultants and architects advising small communities on Federal assistance programs can render valuable service to their clients by accurately explaining workable program objectives and requirements at the earliest possible time and by urging them to develop, and follow, effective workable programs.

There is a prevalent misconception that workable program requirements are designed for large places and are not practical for small communities. Each requirement is, in fact, sufficiently flexible to permit compliance by any sincere community—regardless of size—with reasonable effort and cost. Take code enforcement, for example. While small places certainly do not have the same resources as the large ones, many small communities have found practical ways to carry on an effective code enforcement program. Competent people have been recruited from various sources and trained to handle the technical and administrative aspects of the operation. These are people who can spare some time for such activities. They have been found among community officials, schoolteachers, retired persons, and members of the citizens advisory committee. In some cases, two or more small communities have agreed to share a qualified inspector and, in others, full-time inspectors employed in nearby larger places have agreed to work for the smaller communities during off-duty hours.

Consider also the requirement for comprehensive planning. Every community, no matter how small, that is genuinely interested in improvement and development, should engage in comprehensive planning on a continuing basis—not just for the sake of planning, but to insure orderly development. The scope of this activity obviously varies with the size of the community, although admittedly there is a minimum amount of work involved for the smallest place. The cost of good planning often presents difficulties for small communities, even though the job is proportionately smaller than it is for a larger place. Two-thirds of the cost, however, can be met by a Federal grant under the Urban Renewal Administration's urban planning assistance program. As a matter of fact, officials of smaller communities should be aware of the substantial assistance that is available under the program in connection with other workable program requirements.

URBAN RENEWAL

Federally assisted slum clearance and rehabilitation urban renewal projects are not just for big cities. Of the nearly 800 places now engaged in urban renewal, about 70 percent have populations of less than 50,000. In 1961, Harrison, Ark., with a population of only about 7,000, became eligible for immediate urban renewal assistance through a flood disaster that virtually destroyed the downtown area. The town began rebuilding, with the Federal Government paying three-fourths of the net project cost. Rejuvenation of the prime shopping area brought about a sense of civic pride, and stimulated the economy. Harrison building permits totaled \$5,430,000 for 1963 and 1964. The downtown tax base was increased and fire insurance premiums were decreased.

Small communities have essentially the same major problems in planning and carrying out urban renewal projects as the large places but there are other problems, such as recruitment and retention of adequate staffs, that are usually less serious in large communities. Small places generally will have only one or two projects. The lack of permanency makes the local urban renewal agency a relatively unattractive employer. This, in addition to the fact that the salaries of executive directors must be in line with those for comparable positions in the locality, is often a serious deterrent to obtain-

ing competent administrators. The answer could be better long-range planning by the small communities, so that continuing improvement and development programs could be justified, sustained, and financed.

PUBLIC FACILITIES

Almost universally, small communities have deficient capital improvements programs and wholly inadequate basic public facilities, such as water and sewer systems, to accommodate substantial development. The community facilities administration's public facility loans and public works planning advances are designed to help this situation, since the major obstacle is generally financing. There are other problems, however, connected with the administration of these programs in small communities. For example, there is seldom a local official who is familiar with all facets of municipal finance. Also, the relatively small size of the typical project does not always attract the best engineering, architectural, legal, or construction talent. Despite these problems, many public facility loans are made in small communities. Within the limits of financial feasibility, these places are encouraged to plan and construct facilities that will accommodate future growth. In what is often false economy, some small communities choose to construct the minimum facilities necessary to meet existing requirements, with little or no capacity to meet future needs of a growing community. Reluctance of community leaders temporarily to raise local taxes or utility rates generally accounts for such action.

PUBLIC HOUSING—DEVELOPMENT

Federally assisted housing programs, which are designed to afford people at all income levels maximum freedom of choice in suitable housing can and do play a very important role in small communities. About 85 percent of the 2,000 localities participating in the Public Housing Administration's low-rent public housing program have populations of less than 25,000. Many of these places are under 2,500 and some have less than 1,000 inhabitants.

One of the problems frequently encountered in the development of public housing in small communities is the financial inability of the locality to provide the facilities and services that are required to be furnished under the terms of the cooperation agreement. While the community is obligated to do no more for a local housing authority than it customarily does for any other developer and operator, the cost of meeting this obligation is often considerably larger than the community has previously experienced. Generally, however, arrangements can be made under which the local housing authority finances the cost of installing or constructing the necessary facilities, such as streets or utility extensions, and is reimbursed out of payments in lieu of taxes or the proceeds of bond sales. Greater use of scattered sites in locations where streets and utilities are already in place would minimize this problem. It would also serve to erase the "project" stigma that has given public housing a bad image in some quarters. In most small communities there are plenty of suitable vacant lots, or lots with substandard structures, that can be used for this type of development.

Another common problem in connection with public housing in small communities—although it is by no means confined to them—is the failure of the community to consider the public housing as an integral part of a total improvement and development program. Many times the principal motivation for public housing in a small place is the economic stimulation to the local economy that will result from construction of the housing. And often people from outside the community sell the idea of a public housing development to local officials on this

basis rather than on the basis of the long-term benefits and the relationship of low-rent housing to other community development. This approach too frequently results in a feeling by local people that the public housing is not really a part of their community.

PUBLIC HOUSING—MANAGEMENT

There are also some management problems involved in public housing in small communities. Income from rents, which must generally cover all expenses of operation and maintenance, is not usually sufficient to permit employment of full-time experienced management people. While this problem has been overcome by small communities in many ways, it is a fact that PHA staff personnel have to devote considerably more time to these places than to the larger communities. This, however, is just another example of the special consideration given by the Federal agencies to small communities.

PRIVATE HOUSING

The Federal Housing Administration's programs of mortgage insurance, particularly for single-family homes, are becoming increasingly important for adequate housing in small communities. FHA has recently been engaged in a campaign to create more interest among mortgage lenders in the small community housing market. As a part of this campaign, FHA has relaxed standards to permit the acceptance of many properties situated in areas where it is not practical to obtain conformance with the requirements considered essential for the insurance of mortgages on houses in built-up urban areas. In addition, FHA insuring office staffs are now working more closely with city officials and civic leaders in small communities, offering whatever assistance they can on housing and development matters. Through these contacts, FHA people point out that, while building and site standards have been relaxed for small communities, there are definite long-term advantages to be derived from the development of stable subdivisions through such activities as comprehensive community planning, proper site planning, good street construction, and adequate utility installations.

Recently, lenders have become more interested in the small community market because of the good supply of mortgage money. In the past, they have not needed this market and have avoided it because loan servicing costs are usually higher in small places. They are finding, however, that this additional cost is offset by the quality of the loans. Generally, borrowers in small communities are substantial people whose way of life is to meet all financial obligations. Perhaps the fact that financial difficulties soon become common town knowledge helps to sustain this sense of responsibility.

And, perhaps, this is just another reason why special efforts to preserve the small communities are justified. It could be that small communities have a real contribution to make to our moral standards—and their preservation. Perhaps the sociological benefits that small communities can contribute to the Great Society are as important as their contributions to the Nation's economy and housing supply. And it is conceivable that these sociological benefits in themselves far outweigh the cost of helping small communities in their fight for survival.

SMALL COMMUNITY ADVANTAGES

Regardless of how small communities are motivated to participate in the job of providing adequate housing and good environments for our rapidly increasing population—whether by their fight for survival or by their eagerness for maximum economic development or simply by their desire to improve housing conditions, with no other objective—the results are beneficial. These

places enjoy some advantages that larger communities do not have but they also experience some problems that generally do not bother the larger places. For example, the small community often has stronger motivation for improvement and development and can, therefore, more easily muster local support. And, because of their size, they are sometimes in a better position to undertake a total-job approach than larger communities, where a piecemeal approach is the only practical way.

SMALL COMMUNITY PROBLEMS

But competent leadership with adequate time to devote to improvement programs is usually more difficult to find in small places than in larger ones. In addition, the migration of younger people from small communities to urban centers frequently results in a remaining population that resists change, especially if their homes—no matter how dilapidated—or if their taxes—no matter how low—are likely to be affected.

Most of the problems that are particularly troublesome in small communities are common to all Federal assistance programs for housing and urban development—all of the programs administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency and its constituents. Notable among these problems are the present economic position and future economic potential of the community; the lack of adequate local public financing capacity; the difficulty in obtaining competent technical and administrative personnel; the misunderstanding—or lack of understanding—about programs; the necessity for depending too heavily on consultants and architects; the tendency toward "projectitis," rather than a total-job approach; and the lack of adequate coordination of all improvement and development programs.

To overcome these problems, field offices of the Federal agencies need adequate staffs and travel funds to permit closer working relationships with small communities. Perhaps this is part of the answer to ever increasing problems of a rapidly urbanizing America.

HIGHLY RESPECTED NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE BOARD JOINS LONG LIST OF MARTIN CRITICS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, following is an item from the Washington Post of June 12 that disputes Federal Reserve Board Chairman Martin's observations of June 1 of "disquieting similarities between today and 1929," by Martin R. Gainsbrugh, vice president of the prestigious National Industrial Conference Board. The writer rightly refers to a series of protective measures that has been developed to deal more directly with the basic causes of recession and depression. These include, as the article recites, the Employment Act of 1946, which I actively supported, as well as deposit insurance, unemployment insurance and many others.

The NICB is another among a long list of critics of Chairman Martin's unfortunate and erroneous doomsday message and serves as further proof that Martin's speech was intended to pave the way for further credit tightening by the

Federal Reserve. Such a move would benefit short-term profits for money market banks, but would certainly have grave consequences for the continuation of our unprecedented business prosperity. The article follows:

GAINSBRUGH COUNTERS MARTIN WARNINGS: U.S. ECONOMIC STRENGTHS CITED

SYRACUSE, N.Y., June 11.—National Industrial Conference Board Vice President Martin R. Gainsbrugh today listed some comforting dissimilarities between the Nation's economy today and in 1929.

Gainsbrugh's speech, before the Syracuse Rotary Club, was the latest of a series of economic statements by industry and Government leaders to counter the effect of Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McC. Martin's observations last week of "disquieting similarities" between today and the 1920's.

Martin said the overwhelming impression of recent comparison of the economic scene in the two periods "is that the current situation closely parallels that of 1929 with all the ominous overtones such a conclusion might imply."

He said, however, that as a result of the great depression, a series of protective measures has been developed designed to deal more directly with the basic causes of recession and depression. These include the Employment Act of 1946, which commits the Nation's full resources to whatever action might be required to create high-level employment, margin controls for securities trading, bank guarantees and deposit insurances, and amortized mortgages.

Gainsbrugh also noted that sweeping changes in the structure of industry also provide bulwarks against depression and recession that were nonexistent in the twenties.

He said today's business executives are drawn more from professional talent "trained in the discipline of business decisionmaking at graduate schools of business and through executive seminars."

Gainsbrugh noted that investment decisions today "reflect far more organized deliberation and determination of future market potential than was possible in the 1920's, and that American enterprise today is more multiproduct and multinational in that, should demand fall off in one sector, such diversification would mitigate against as sharp a curtailment of employment and production as took place after 1929."

CONTINUED ILLEGAL SOVIET CONTROL OF THE THREE BALTIC NATIONS—LITHUANIA, LATVIA, AND ESTONIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI], is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include resolution adopted by the Baltic States Committee for Congressional Action; also that all Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in requesting the hour of time this afternoon is to permit Members to join me in a discussion of the continued illegal Soviet control of the three Baltic nations, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

On June 16, 1940, the Soviet Union seized the three Baltic nations, and a year later, on June 13, 1941, thousands of government, business, and religious leaders of these lands were seized and shipped to slave labor camps in Siberia.

The peoples of the three Baltic States were victims of the Stalin-Hitler deal in the early days of World War II, and their illegal incorporation into the U.S.S.R. remains one of the major unresolved world problems.

The failure of the United Nations to investigate the basic denial of fundamental human rights of the Baltic peoples indicates the paralysis that the Soviet Union and other Communist states have caused in the international organization, since the United Nations should be working to protect the right of all peoples to self-determination and freedom to pursue their own economic, social, cultural, and religious development.

The denial of the rights of self-determination of the peoples of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia is a matter that should be on the agenda of the United Nations, and the U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., Adlai Stevenson, should without hesitation raise this question in order to direct the attention of the world to the Communist enslavement of the Baltic peoples.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most active organizations working toward the restoration of freedom to the people of the Baltic States is the "Americans for Congressional Action To Free the Baltic States." I place in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks a resolution adopted by that organization entitled "Twenty-five years in the Communist Russian Slavery."

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS IN THE COMMUNIST RUSSIAN SLAVERY—SOVIET GENOCIDAL PRACTICES IN THE BALTIC STATES

Since June 15, 1940, the Baltic States have been suffering in the Soviet captivity. The Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by force of arms.

The Baltic States have never experienced in their long history through centuries such an extermination and annihilation of their people as during this Soviet occupation since June 15, 1940. During the last 25 years the countries lost more than one-fourth of their entire population. Hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians were murdered by the Kremlin despots or died in exile in Soviet slave-labor camps and prisons in Siberia and other places of Communist Russia. At least 20 percent of the present population of Soviet-occupied Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are not the Balts, but the Soviet colonists. The genocidal operations and practices being carried out by the Soviets continue with no end in sight. Bearing in mind that all of the murdered and deported people have been the most educated, courageous, industrious, comprising the strongest elements of the countries, the losses in population become more terrible and almost fatal to the survival of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian nations.

But let us now return to the details of the Soviet occupation of Lithuania. At the same time that the forces of occupation were entrenching themselves and the mock elections were being carried out in 1940, leaders and active members of all non-Communist political parties and thousands of public officials were arrested. This was but a prelude to one of the most despicable acts of modern

times; namely, the mass deportations that ensued. Interrupted only by a temporary Nazi occupation of Lithuania from 1941 to 1944, when the Soviets reoccupied Lithuania, these deportations went on for about a decade. People from every walk of life, even old and dying people, were put on cattle freight cars for the 3-week journey to Siberia or remote areas near the Arctic Ocean. The number of all the deportees amounted to about 20 percent of the population, or 600,000 Lithuanians. In 2 nights alone of June 1941, 34,260 Lithuanians were deported to the horribly miserable conditions of the slave-labor camps. The consequent death toll of these deportees was very high.

With the increase of physical terrorization by the Soviets, a strong Lithuanian underground resistance organization was formed and fought the Soviets. It was a heroic and widespread resistance movement, but it was a costly one: after the war about 30,000 died in battles with Russian Communists.

The Baltic States are more than 700-year-old nations and they have the same right to be free and independent as any new state in Asia or Africa. We should have a single standard for freedom. Its denial in the whole or in part, any place in the world, including the Soviet Union is surely intolerable.

Mr. Speaker, the United States, as the moral as well as military leader of the free world, recognizes its responsibility to bring about a world of complete peace and true freedom. We will not have complete peace and true freedom until all the peoples now subject to Communist control are given an opportunity to pursue their own legitimate national goals. It is especially important that we recognize the legal and moral basis on which the Baltic peoples ask for their independence.

The leaders in exile of the Baltic States are maintaining very effective and practical programs, working to restore freedom to their homelands. Wherever peoples of the Baltic States have recongregated in the free world, they zealously, progressively, and effectively are working to restore freedom to their homelands. A special point that they emphasize, in addition to the natural demand to place the Baltic States question on the U.N. agenda, is to appeal to the conscience of the world by their activities to recognize the strong moral, legal, and political cause that is theirs.

One of the proposals they are now considering is the feasibility of having a "free Baltic radio ship" which would move in international waters in the Baltic Sea and beam radio messages of truth to the peoples of the Baltic States who are held in bondage by Soviet Russia. As you know, the Voice of America broadcasts to the Baltic States leave much to be desired. They are lacking in practical reports on world conditions. Radio Free Europe does not beam broadcasts to the Baltic States.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I ask leave that the following Members be permitted to revise and extend their remarks: Representatives SCHISLER, STANTON, FRIEDEL, ADAIR, GERALD FORD, OTTINGER, KING of New York, TODD, DANIELS, DULSKI, CLEVELAND, KLUCZYNSKI, HALPERN, ROBINO, BRAY, FRELINGHUYSEN, GARMATZ, SCHNEEBELI, MURPHY of Illinois, BOB WILSON, FLOOD, JOELSON, NELSEN, FARBERSTEIN, DADDARIO, ALBERT, FALLON, PUCINSKI.

It is my hope that Americans who are participating in the various programs to restore freedom to the Baltic States will be heartened by this tremendous display of interest and concern on the part of the Members of the House.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. Speaker, I also request that the Members be given 5 legislative days during which to place their comments on the Baltic States question in the RECORD.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, June 15 marks the 25th anniversary of Soviet aggression against the Baltic States. A quarter century ago the Red army poured into Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, and unseated their legitimate governments. From these lands she commenced her westward march against Europe. The Baltic States were the proving grounds for her doctrine of expropriation, exploitation, enslavement and pauperization.

The problems which have created international tension and endanger world peace today were forecast by the Soviet Union's assault against her Baltic neighbors. The breaking of the peace, the violation of nonaggression treaties, the disregard for human rights, are issues basic to world conflicts today.

At issue today is not territory, not resources, but the right of self-determination, the right to hold free elections, the right to assemble, the right to form trade unions, the right to worship according to individual conscience, the right to be secure against loss of life and loss of property, against arbitrary arrest and forced labor. As long as these rights—the bedrock of man's freedom and fulfillment, are suppressed or limited, there can be no peace in the world.

On this 25th anniversary of Soviet aggression against the Baltic States, we pay tribute to the courage and dedication of her people who continue to pray and work for the opportunity to rejoin the community of free men. We must support their liberation by our condemnation of all crimes against civil liberties, and by maintaining peaceful efforts to restore human rights in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and in all parts of the globe.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, on this 14th of June, 1965, 25 years after the Russian seizure of the three Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, it is appropriate that all Americans recall the extensive imperialism of the U.S.S.R.

and communism and reassert their determination to prevent further Soviet aggression and to restore the governments of all lost lands to their rightful inhabitants.

This incursion on their self-rule was bravely resisted by the people of these states, and the hope of regaining their independence and democracy is still alive in those who still live in their native country and in those who reside outside of it.

Today is Baltic Freedom Day, commemorating the massive deportation of the inhabitants of these Baltic States to the far corners of the Soviet Empire. America expresses her deepest sympathy to these people, many of whom are in concentration camps and none of whom enjoy the right of independence for their homeland.

The United States has sought to live in peaceful coexistence with Russia, but her people will continue to object to such obvious violations of the integrity of a nation. America hopes that the Baltic Nations Committee will continue its efforts and will, in the not too distant future, be able to realize its goals of three free and democratic Baltic States.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago this week the Soviet Union without any provocation invaded the territory of the Republics of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, and forcibly brought these sovereign nations into the Soviet slave orbit.

Despite the fact that the Soviet Union has formally agreed to respect the territorial integrity of these nations on four separate occasions, at Brest-Litovsk—the treaty between the Soviets and Imperial Germany which ended Russian participation in World War I was signed on March 3, 1918, in the peace treaty of April 12, 1920, which was held to solve the boundary question, as part of the nonaggression pact of September 28, 1926, the terms of which were to last until 1945 and as part of the mutual assistance pact of October 10, 1939, these freedom loving nations were absorbed by the Soviet tyranny.

Despite these solemn pledges to respect these independent nations, the Soviet Union has for 25 years consistently denied the legitimate national aspirations of these ancient peoples and used every imperialistic device to Russify the people of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

In the spirit of our great President Woodrow Wilson, the United States has always insisted upon the right of self-determination for all people. And, in fact, it was in part through the good offices of this country that many of the now enslaved nations of Eastern Europe were granted independence during the all too brief period between two great World Wars.

The United States has never recognized the Soviet conquest of the Baltic

States as we have never wavered in our position that these unfortunate people have become part of the Soviet Union only over their most violent protests. The Soviet persecution of those who stood for freedom in these tragic nations is a dark stain on the pages of history.

On this day as we consider the tragic plight of the people of the Baltic States, let us rededicate ourselves to the proposition that we shall not rest until all the people behind the Iron Curtain enjoy the opportunity to direct their own destinies.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, June 15 marks a tragic anniversary in the turbulent history of the Balkan nations.

At the end of the First World War, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia had regained their liberty after years of Russian rule. They began a new era of freedom and established their own democratic governments. All three became members of the world family of nations. They rebuilt their war-ravaged countries and endeavored to raise their standard of living. None had an abundance of natural resources, but through self-determination and hard work they succeeded in making an admirable record. Agricultural reforms were initiated and large estates broken up, which resulted in a period of agricultural prosperity.

Unfortunately, in 1940 these three republics were again menaced by a totalitarian monster. In the middle of 1940 they were occupied by the Red army, deprived of their independence, and then made part of the Soviet Union. Over 60,000 Estonians, 34,000 Latvians, and 45,000 Lithuanians were either executed or arrested and forcefully deported from their homelands to distant corners of the Soviet Union on the charge that they were "politically unreliable."

This happened 25 years ago, and today the kinsmen of these peoples all over the free world are observing the anniversary of this sad event.

We have denounced this crime of aggression. We have never recognized the forceful incorporation of these three countries by the U.S.S.R. In the passage of the captive nations resolution by the Congress in 1959, we reaffirmed our policy of nonrecognition.

Although freedom was short lived in these tiny Balkan nations, their yearnings for liberty have not subsided and remain deeply entrenched in the hearts and minds of the Baltic people.

Early in this session of Congress I again sponsored a measure, House Concurrent Resolution 76, which calls upon the Congress to request the President to bring up the Baltic States question in the United Nations, and to ask the United Nations to request the Soviets to withdraw from Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, return Baltic exiles, and provide for free elections under the supervision of the United Nations. This resolution reaffirms a basic principle of U.S. foreign policy—self-determination of all peoples,

the right of people to select their own form of government.

It is important not only to the Baltic people but to the free world that we continue to strive diligently for the freedom of these peoples, and I urge the Congress to approve this resolution.

It is well that we pause here today and remember the tragic history of the Baltic people. We hope and pray for their eventful liberation, and look forward to the day when they will once again enjoy precious freedom under their own government.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, today is Flag Day, when we honor our flag and the principles for which it stands. It is especially fitting that also we take this occasion to discuss and commemorate the brutal seizure of the Baltic nations, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, which was carried out 25 years ago by the Soviet Union, in violation of treaties and international law.

Our flag was created to rally our forces in our Revolution against colonialism. It remains today a symbol of freedom from foreign domination. The fight for freedom continues around the world and our flag and our country will remain in danger until the last threat of foreign domination is abolished from the earth.

Have the Soviets changed since the seizure of the Baltic nations? The answer clearly is "No." These small, proud, and ancient lands are still oppressed. Unlike the other Communist satellite countries, there is no attempt to maintain even the fiction of independence through the operation of native-born Communist puppets. The Baltic nations were seized directly and incorporated as part of the Soviet Union. Iron control is maintained by the Red army. Hundreds of thousands of their citizens have been carried off to slave labor camps deep within the Soviet Union. The stricken peoples left behind are denied all those elements of personal liberty—freedom of religion, press, speech—that we take so much for granted.

The terrible condition of the Baltic States, which continues unabated despite the moral condemnation of the world, is proof positive that Soviet goals have not changed and that international communism continues to represent forces that would enslave the world.

These violated countries stand as a warning to those who would have us barter the fates of others at the negotiating table. The sworn pledges of the Communists are worthless and, to the extent that they are relied upon by still trusting nations, they are dangerous.

Let us take these moments in this Chamber of free government to remember that the battle for freedom is far from won; that we have a long, arduous, dangerous road to travel. Let us renew our resolves to see this fight through, re-

gardless of the perils along the way. Let us pause in tribute to the enslaved peoples, not only in the Baltic States, but throughout the world and let us pay special homage to the spirit of the Baltic States that never will be crushed no matter how savage the oppressor is.

I wish to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] for reserving this time. It is an important demonstration of continuing American concern and of our dedication to the cause of freedom.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sad heart that I join my colleagues in this Chamber in commemorating the 25th anniversary of the seizure of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union.

We have every reason to be sad on this occasion because it marks not only the destruction of the independence and freedom of a great and heroic people, but it also marks the beginning of the Soviet thrust into eastern Europe that in the closing days of World War II brought Soviet power deep into central Europe.

Sad though we may be, Mr. Speaker, still it is well for us to derive what lessons that are possible from this infamous seizure of the Baltic States; for such lessons can be a reliable guide as we move forward into the uncharted waters of the 1960's.

Obviously, when we reflect upon this event we are surely inclined to count our own blessings as freemen living in a free society.

But what is more important for the purposes of the cold war, this conquest reveals the awful might of raw Soviet power in action. If any of the so-called neutral states of the world today have any thoughts upon the "generous" nature of the Soviet Union, particularly its attitude of not wishing to interfere in the internal affairs of independent states—if there are any neutrals who delude themselves into feeling this way, and I am sure there are many, then I say, look at this case study of the Baltic States. They will find little assurance for their folly from this tragic example of Soviet power engaged for expansionist purposes. Let them consider this incident of infamy before they make any firm conclusions concerning the fidelity of the Soviet Union in its pledges not to interfere in the internal affairs of other states.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there are many lessons to be learned from the tragedy of the Baltic States, and it is well for us to contemplate them as we stand now at the mid-1960's in the cold war. There is, after all, a durability in Soviet attitudes and conduct that should induce caution among the careless and concern among the unwary.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] may ex-

tend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, all wars cause death and desolation to countless innocent people. But some suffer more than others and for a longer period. During the last world war the Baltic peoples suffered more than many other combatant nations in that war. These peoples, the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians were among the first victims of the war, and unfortunately their suffering is not over yet.

These hardly, rugged workers, justly proud of their robust and distinct individuality, these dauntless fighters for freedom, had regained their independence at the end of the First World War and were enjoying their richly deserved freedom in their historic homeland under their chosen forms of democratic government. For two decades they worked hard, made all kinds of sacrifices to make their respective countries safe havens for themselves. They were quite content with their lot. But the Second World War brought on a period of misery and misfortune which has become part of their unenviable lot for a quarter of a century.

Early in the war the Soviet Government took full advantage of the weakness and helplessness of these peoples, and imposed by force its tyrannical Communist system upon them. First the governments of these countries were forced to sign mutual assistance pacts with the Soviet Union. Then they were compelled to allow Russian garrisons to be stationed in these countries. Finally, in June of 1940 the Red army became master of these countries. Thus the Baltic peoples were robbed of their freedom and independence, and had become prisoners of the Red army. At the same time Soviet agents instituted a veritable reign of terror in all these countries. Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians by the tens of thousands were arrested, imprisoned, and then deported to the eastern part of the Soviet Union. The terror continued until several hundred thousand people were deported from their homes, while the rest were subjected to the ruthless regimentation of the newly established Communist regimes.

It is sad and tragic that we have to solemnize the 25th anniversary of this tragedy while the fate of its victims, some 5 million Baltic peoples, is still unsettled and uncertain. We all ardently hope and pray that sometime soon these people will regain their freedom and live in peace. America has not, and will not, forsake or forget these first victims of Soviet imperialism.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, during this month of June we commemorate the 25th anniversary of the conquest of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union.

On this particular occasion I wish to call to the attention of the Members of this Chamber to House Concurrent Resolution 41 which I had submitted in January of this year. This resolution portrays in a forceful way the present condition of the Baltic States as being one of total loss of freedom and independence. In clear and unequivocal terms it refers to the enslavement of the Baltic peoples and to the deportation of great numbers of law-abiding persons from their native lands to imprisonment in slave labor camps throughout the Soviet Union.

The resolution then declares that it is the sense of Congress that the President should continue the American policy of nonrecognition; that the President should take steps as may be appropriate through the American delegation in the United Nations to raise the question of the forced incorporation of the Baltic States in the Soviet Union; that the United Nations investigate conditions in the Baltic States; that Soviet authority be withdrawn from the area and that the exiled peoples be returned in freedom at which time free elections will be held under United Nations supervision.

If the Soviet Union were confident that the Baltic peoples would opt for continued Soviet domination, they would have nothing to fear from the intention of this resolution. But, the fact is that the Soviet Union knows that the Baltic peoples are an oppressed people; that they would seek genuine freedom if they had the opportunity; and that the Soviet Union and its Communist allies, not the United States and its western allies, constitute the real force of imperialism and colonialism in the modern era.

On this occasion, Mr. Speaker, I believe it necessary to remind this Chamber again of the intention of my resolution, for it is a resolution that speaks from the deep-rooted sympathy that Americans have for peoples who are oppressed by communism.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania have much in common. Each was forced to become a part of Russia by czarist military force during the 18th and very early 19th centuries. Each gained its independence from Russia in the closing days and immediately after World War I, and as free countries made great progress socially and economically. Russia by treaty guaranteed to respect the freedom and independence of each of these countries.

Each of these countries was betrayed by the infamous Hitler-Stalin secret treaty of August 23, 1939, whereby Hitler agreed that Stalin could take over any of them at will. Soon after this secret treaty, Russia demanded that these

countries allow her to establish bases and place Russian troops in each country, in each instance guaranteeing freedom and political integrity.

Each country objected strongly to the surrendering of bases to Russia and to the placing of Russian troops on her territory. Russia massed troops and made threats of military invasion unless her demands were met, repeating again and again solemn promises not to interfere with the internal affairs of these countries. Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania finally succumbed to Russian pressure and threats and allowed Russia the bases. In each instance Russia violated her pledge and followed her established pattern of persecutions and executions and by force and subversion overthrew the government and installed puppet governments.

It might be well to outline very briefly Russia's course of action against each of these countries:

Latvia: The Latvians revolted against the czars in 1905 and, although defeated, were given representation in the Russian Duma. At the time of the Russian revolution in 1917, the Russian democratic provisional government granted Latvia independence; however, on December 5, 1918, Soviet troops invaded Latvia and executed, according to Russian figures, 3,632 Latvians. Latvia drove out the invaders and, by the Treaty of Riga in 1920, gained independence. On February 4, 1932, Russia and Latvia entered into a nonaggression treaty which on April 4, 1934, was extended to December 31, 1945. In article I of this treaty each country promised to "refrain from any act of aggression directed against the other and also from any acts of violence directed against the territorial integrity and inviolability of the political independence of the other."

Russia taking advantage of the terms of the Russian-German secret treaty of August 23, 1939, practically forced Latvia to sign a mutual assistance pact on October 8, 1940, which gave Russia control of the Gulf of Riga, as well as military bases and airfields, and allowed the quartering of 30,000 Russian troops in Latvia. The Soviet legation flooded the country with Soviet propaganda, threatening the government and advocating its overthrow. Then followed the Russian pattern of conquest that became common during the next 8 years. By intimidation, force, and subversion the Russian puppet government was placed in control.

On July 6, 1940, the Latvian puppet Prime Minister announced to the Latvian people that:

The Red Army is assisting us in the defense of our freedom and the defense of our state—once again I salute the freedom and independence of the Latvian Republic. We are still and will remain free, for we believe in the promises of Stalin, the highest authority of the Soviet Union.

Fifteen days later, against a background of Red flags and a large picture of Stalin and Lenin, the puppet parliament—its members virtually unknown to the people—proclaimed the "Latvian Soviet Republic" and requested permission to admit "Soviet Latvia as a part of the

Soviet Union." It was difficult to lower the Latvian high standard of living to that of Russia, but by murder, pillage, and deportations Russia succeeded.

Estonia: The Estonians, a Fino-Ugrian people, having no racial or linguistic heritage in common with the Slavs, the Germans or their neighboring Baltic people, were conquered by imperialistic Russia in 1710. At the close of World War I the Soviet forces were driven out of the country and a constituent assembly was formed in April 1919, which guaranteed civil rights and liberties. On February 2, 1920, a peace treaty was signed at Tartu, whereby Russia recognized Estonia as an independent state and renounced "voluntarily and forever all rights of sovereignty formerly held by Russia over the Estonian people and territory."

Estonia enjoyed freedom until after Hitler and Stalin negotiated their infamous treaty of August 23, 1939, whereby Russia was free to take over the Baltic States at will. On September 15, 1939, Russia amassed a quarter of a million troops with artillery, tanks, and planes adjacent to Estonia and demanded that Estonia's Foreign Minister come to Moscow where he was told to agree to a mutual assistance pact granting Russia the right to station 35,000 troops, together with airplanes, at selected strategic points. Molotov assured the Estonian Foreign Minister that:

We want to confirm that the Government of the Soviet Union has no desire to force upon Estonia communism or Soviet regime, nor in general to infringe in the slightest degree the sovereignty of Estonia and the independence of Estonia. The entire social system and public regime with its own government and parliament, foreign representations, etc., remains unalterably in force as an internal matter of the Estonian state.

On September 26, 1939, this mutual assistance pact was signed. The New York Times on the following day prophetically said:

The little Baltic republic passed under the full domination of the Soviet Union.

This proved to be true.

A puppet parliament was illegally elected, its 80 members having been picked by the Communist Party to confirm decisions already made in Moscow; and it began its sessions on July 21, 1940. Soviet troops and tanks ringed the Parliament Building. The resignation of President Pats, who was already a prisoner of the Russians, was accepted. Estonia was duly admitted to the U.S.S.R. on August 6, 1940. The usual murders and arrests and robberies took place. About 40,000 were sent to slave-labor camps and about 150,000 were deported to Russia. So the Russian Bear swallowed up another free people.

Lithuania: Lithuania is neither Slavic nor German in language or race. It came under czarist rule in the 18th century. The Lithuanian people have fought four unsuccessful revolutions against Russian control, one of them being led by Kosciusko, later a great hero of the American Revolution. These revolutions have been put down by the Russians with great cruelty, but apparently this in no

way dampened the Lithuanian desire for freedom. After the successful Communist revolution during and at the end of World War I, Moscow recognized the independence of Lithuania. On January 5, 1919, a Soviet government again recognized "the sovereignty and independence of the State of Lithuania * * * and voluntarily and forever renounced all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory."

On September 28, 1926, a nonaggression pact was signed by Lithuania and Russia whereby each agreed to "respect each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity and to refrain from any act of aggression against the other."

On April 4, 1934, on the occasion of the extensions of the treaty to December 31, 1945, Mr. Litvinov, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Russia, said:

The whole world must know that our proposal is not of a temporary character, has not been caused by incidental conjectural circumstances, but is an expression of our constant, termless policy of peace, of which the fundamental element is preservation of independence of the young states which you are representing here.

Lithuania's turn as one of the subjects of the secret Hitler-Stalin pact came on September 26, 1939, when Russia asked for a mutual assistance pact whereby the Russians would place 50,000 troops in Lithuania. Lithuania violently objected, stating that this would reduce her to a vassal state. Stalin was adamant, and said:

We consider the creation of military bases on Lithuanian territory as a symbolic gesture * * * whereas we respect the independence of the Lithuanian state. We are disposed to defend its territorial integrity.

By October 10, 1939, Russia had concentrated forces on the Lithuanian border; and Lithuania signed the pact Russia demanded.

For 6 months after the Russian bases were established in Lithuania all went well; but as soon as the Soviet-Finland peace was signed in 1940, the Soviet attitude changed, and they began to attack and to undermine the Lithuanian Government. Many in Lithuania were naive enough to believe that Russia was sincere in stating that she would respect the integrity of the Lithuanian Government. The Deputy Prime Minister went to Moscow to complain to Molotov that the Soviet legation and the Red army were interfering in internal affairs of the Lithuanian state. Molotov quickly pointed out to him the true Russian intent by saying:

Your Lithuania along with other Baltic nations, including Finland, will have to join the glorious family of the Soviet Union. Therefore, you should begin now to initiate your people into the Soviet system which in the future shall reign everywhere, throughout all Europe—put into practice earlier in some places, as in the Baltic nations—later in others.

In the usual manner Lithuania was accepted into the Soviet Union. Although all of the Baltic States remained plainly hostile to Russia, the Lithuanians were especially so; and when the German-Russian war began in June 1941,

the Lithuanians, including many who were in the Russian Army, rebelled against Russia. Between June 14 and June 21, 1941, more than 34,000 persons were deported to Siberia and the Arctic. In 1948 and 1949, about 10 percent of the Lithuania population was deported to Siberia.

The Russian bear had again gorged himself.

Russia's forceful subjugation of the Baltic States should be kept ever before the world. This is one of the principal reasons that there should be established a House Committee on Captive Nations. Many of us have been working toward getting such a committee established for several years.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take advantage of the opportunity presented today to make a statement for the RECORD on the 24th anniversary of the deportation by the Soviet Union of thousands of Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians from their countries. In many cases those deported have never been heard from again. Those Baltic peoples remaining in their countries have been denied freedom of speech, religion, press, and other basic rights. Additionally, they have been forced to abandon their native languages for Russian, and have been compelled to live under communism.

Today's anniversary allows us to pay homage to those who have been so shabbily treated by Soviet Russia. The people of the Baltic nations have historically shown a great love of freedom, and have demonstrated a spirit of liberty and a continued willingness to resist oppression. Their time of travail has been watched with sadness by all the free world, and particularly by the United States, where so many of their friends and relatives have become valued citizens. I cannot allow this anniversary occasion to pass without saluting the people of the Baltic states, and protesting once again the illegal seizure of their homelands by the Soviet Union.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, the continued enslavement of the Baltic countries of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Soviet Union, in defiance of world opinion and the dictates of humanity, is contrary to all the principles of justice and freedom upon which our country was founded. Such continued enslavement is a particularly heinous crime, the enormity of which must be impressed again and again upon the

world through the United Nations, so many of whose members, while demanding full exercise of national and individual freedom for themselves, choose to ignore the tragedy which Soviet lawlessness has foisted upon the splendid peoples of these once proud Baltic nations.

In wholehearted support of my resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 14, and of the many similar resolutions sponsored by Members of Congress from all sections of this great country, I urge that your committee take up the cudgels in behalf of these enslaved peoples. We cannot, as a Nation, continue to remain silent in the face of such wanton disregard of all international usage. Our representation at the United Nations must be persuaded to present to that international body the crimes that have been inflicted upon these three once-prosperous and proud nations.

I recall that, in commenting upon a similar resolution in 1963, the Department of State reported that it "believes that it is preferable to continue to focus world attention on the injustices suffered by the Baltic and other captive peoples as the occasion arises during the course of debate in the General Assembly and the Security Council."

Statements were made on the subject, we were told, in 1961 and 1962, and our late lamented President took the issue before the General Assembly in his address there on September 25, 1961.

However, the Soviets do not wait for opportunity to arise when they want to accuse the United States of alleged crimes. They make the opportunity. Here we have clear cause for shocking the conscience of the world with irrefutable charges of Soviet injustice and brutality—of deportations, prison and slave camps, and woes of every description, visited upon peoples of the highest types. There are many persons of Lithuanian birth or ancestry in my own State of Maryland, and I can say, from my long and close association with them, that they, as a group, are as cultured, loyal, and industrious as the best of our citizenry anywhere. And the same applies to the fewer persons of Latvian or Estonian birth or ancestry in our State.

The illegal absorption of their mother countries into the U.S.S.R., with the accompanying repression, deportations, and ruthless military rule, was a crime that must not be allowed to endure for lack of attention to it. If the United States is to remain loyal to its own basic principles, it must not hesitate to proclaim to all the world just what occurred in these three Baltic countries.

The Soviet action in these countries was a brazen instance of coldblooded, brutal contempt for human rights and international principles of conduct. Our country must not hesitate to seek justice for these peoples because "the time is not appropriate." Any time is appropriate for seeking redress of human rights that have been outraged as have the rights of citizens of these three countries.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHNEEBELI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, during the modern history of the three Baltic countries their peoples have undergone a great amount of misfortune and suffering. Actually, they have been allowed to enjoy freedom and happiness in their historic homelands only for the two-decade period between the World Wars. After having to bow to foreign rule for centuries, the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians regained their independence at the end of World War I, rebuilt their war-torn countries, and were enjoying their freedom. They wanted nothing more than to be let alone, to work out their own salvation in their own way. This choice was not permitted them for very long. Their neighbor, the Soviet Union, seemed bent on putting an end to their freedom and independence. This was accomplished in early 1940 when the three countries were attacked and occupied by the Red army.

After arresting and exiling all the leaders and prominent citizens of the countries invaded, the once-free democratic Republics were annexed to the Soviet Union. The saddest part of this treacherous maneuver was the cruel and inhuman way in which the arrests and deportations of thousands of Baltic nationals were carried out by the Russian officials. The innocent and helpless people were herded into freight cars and carried to distant parts of the Soviet Union, there to remain for a quarter century. After years of suffering, a small percentage of them have found their way to their former homes but most died in exile. Even those who have returned home are not free to live the way they would like but continue in bondage. It is our earnest hope that soon these brave peoples of the Baltic nations will regain their much loved and deserved freedom.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURPHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 25th anniversary of the Soviet seizure of the Baltic States, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

This is a tragic occasion in the annals of Baltic history; for it was during these trouble-ridden months in the summer of 1940 that the freedom and independence, once so precious a possession of the Baltic peoples, had been destroyed by the Soviet Union.

In the autumn of 1939 the Soviet Union had imposed upon these nations the so-called pacts of mutual assistance. By these pacts the Soviet Union began to put into operation a series of events that led finally to the destruction of Baltic independence. Within a very short time the Soviet Red Army conquered the Baltic States. The freedom and independence that those nations had cherished

now came to an abrupt end. Never again were these peoples to enjoy their natural right of self-determination.

These are the tragic facts of history, Mr. Speaker.

The Baltic peoples are today a captive people.

The Baltic States enjoy neither freedom nor independence in any realm of their lives. Theirs is an other-directed existence.

The destiny of the Baltic peoples is a destiny determined not by themselves but rather a destiny determined solely by the Soviet leadership in Moscow.

On this occasion of commemorating the 25th anniversary of the Soviet seizure of the Baltic States it is fitting that we pay tribute to those heroic peoples, the Lithuanians, the Latvians, and the Estonians.

Yet, this is also an occasion from which the world today can well take note, for in this tragic event there lies a lesson to be learned by all free peoples and that lesson is the threat that Soviet communism holds for all freemen and all free institutions.

The Soviet Union has no just claim to possession of the Baltic States. These peoples share no common heritage with the Russians. Their cultures, their languages, their religions have little in common with the ways of the Russians. Yet, the Soviet Union conquered the Baltic States, and the purposes underlying their conquest were the singular desire to expand communism and to enlarge the power of the Soviet state.

This is a lesson we can learn from this tragic occasion of 25 years ago and on this anniversary it is well that we bear this lesson in mind.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TODD] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my distinguished colleague, Mr. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, for being so thoughtful to take the time this afternoon to recognize the plight of the citizens of the Baltic nations. As one who knows many natives of these countries who have fled to the United States, and who have settled here, may I express my sympathy to them and to their families left home overseas.

I am certain that loss of freedom is especially felt by these people, because of their traditions of independence and individuality. In this country, they have become leading and responsible citizens and have greatly enriched our society.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the people of the Baltic

States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia who saw the national independence of their governments destroyed and their lands occupied by the Soviet Union 25 years ago this month. They remain to this day under the boot of Red Russia.

These small nations, created out of the hopes and dreams of the Allied Powers at the conclusion of the First World War, had only 20 years to practice the demanding ways of self-government. But even this small experience gave to them a sturdy and abiding taste for the vigorous progress possible in states affording freedom to its citizens. And so, when the Russians moved against them, and the Allies, preoccupied with the menace of Hitler, did not help them, the brave people of the Baltic resisted in spite of the overwhelming odds.

As a result, massive, incredibly cruel deportations took place during 1940 and 1941. Twenty-four years ago tonight, for example, about 10,000 Estonian men, women, and children were arrested and shipped in cattle cars to Siberia and northern Russia. From Latvia, 15,600 were similarly shipped off to forced labor, enslavement, ruination. Lithuania, during the week of June 14-21, lost 34,260 compatriots to the Red wastelands. The survivors of these and the other great deportations were few.

Let the people of the Baltic and their heirs in this country know that the people of the United States have not forgotten them, nor the injustices done to them. Let them know we recognize their present oppression, understand that free speech, press, assembly, and religion are still systematically denied to them. Let them know the people of America support their liberation, as we have always supported the principles of national independence, the self-determination of peoples, and individual freedom upon which human dignity must rest.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] may extend his remarks at this point in the record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the peoples of the three Baltic countries—Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians—had their ups and downs in the course of their long and turbulent history. They enjoyed their happiest years during their independence subsequent to World War I, and unfortunately the saddest period in their national history began soon after the outbreak of the Second World War.

After suffering under foreign rule, and particularly under the autocratic regime of Russian czars, the brave and gallant peoples of these three Baltic countries regained their national independence at the end of the First World War, set up their own democratic governments, diligently rebuilt their war-ravaged countries, and were leading a relatively prosperous and contented life. These Latvians, Estonians, and Lithuanians felt that in freedom and independence they had attained their national goals, and

their task was to maintain and safeguard these goals.

With the aid and encouragement of their friends abroad, and under the guidance of their patriotic and wise leaders, the peoples of these three countries succeeded in doing this; they managed to maintain their independent status until late 1939. Then with the deterioration of the international situation, and with the loss of the backing of their friends in the West, they found themselves in danger of losing their freedom. Unfortunately their worse apprehensions proved correct.

Early in 1940 Stalin's ruthless henchmen imposed upon them totalitarian communism and then annexed these countries to the Soviet Union. At the same time Stalin's minions caused the arrest of several hundred thousand Baltic nationals and these were exiled to distant parts of Asiatic Russia. This mass deportation, this inhuman act, was carried out in mid-1940 under abominable and indescribable misery. People were uprooted from their homes and in freight cars shipped off to perpetual exile. All this was done 25 years ago, and today the anniversary of that event is being observed with due solemnity. On this occasion we pay tribute to the memory of those who suffered and died in exile, and pray for the freedom of those who still endure hardships in Soviet prison camps.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join my distinguished colleague [Mr. DERWINSKI] in commemorating today the 25th anniversary of Soviet aggression against the Baltic States.

This is an anniversary of extraordinary significance to the entire free world, and certainly one that we in the United States should commemorate in a particularly meaningful manner.

For, Mr. Speaker, the free world has forgotten that the major powers of the Western democracies to this day refuse to recognize the illegal seizure of the three Baltic nations—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—by the Soviet Union.

As a matter of fact, to this day the United States recognizes here in our country the official diplomatic mission of prewar Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

It would appear to me that we have not paid sufficient notice to the diplomatic missions in the United States from these three nations for these ambassadors are a living reminder of the treachery perpetuated upon their respective countries by the Soviet Union. It would be my hope that our Government would give these three brave representatives of these three prewar Baltic nations greater recognition and greater stature so they could become a more eloquent voice in reminding the world how their three nations were wiped off the map by Soviet deceit. It would be my hope that the United

States would enlist the help of these diplomatic missions to go to some of the uncommitted nations of the world as spokesmen for the cause of freedom and in these nations, many of whom today are flirting with communism, let these representatives of the Baltic States describe their own experience at the hands of Soviet deception.

Mr. Speaker, it would also be my hope that on this 25th anniversary, the United States would rededicate itself to the proposition that there can be no lasting peace in this world so long as an Iron Curtain separates the free world from the captive nations, including the three Baltic States which we honor today.

Mr. Speaker, the Baltic States Freedom Council has issued a scathing manifesto which lays bare the depth of Soviet infamy in destroying the institutions of freedom in these three Baltic States. I believe the Baltic States Freedom Council has performed a significant service to all of us by documenting the case against the Soviet Union. I should like to take this opportunity to reprint the manifesto in its entirety at this point. Following the manifesto, which describes so eloquently the injustice committed against the Latvians, the Estonians, and the Lithuanians, I should like to include a brief memorandum prepared by the Lithuanian American Information Center describing the Soviet seizure and occupation of Lithuania.

Both these documents belong to history for they describe not only the illegal occupation of the Baltic States by Soviet forces 25 years ago, but they also tell of the inhuman mass deportations from the Baltic States of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania to Siberia which was started by the Communists in June of 1941.

Mr. Speaker, to this day the Soviet Union has not dared tell the world what has happened to the hundreds of thousands of citizens from the Baltic States which were taken by the Soviets to Siberia. Where are the voices of those who profess to be concerned with human dignity in regard to demanding an explanation of these monstrous crimes committed by the Soviets against the people of these three Baltic States? It would be my hope that even at this late date the free world would demand that whatever Baltic State nationals are still alive in Soviet concentration camps, they would be liberated immediately.

Mr. Speaker, the two documents I mentioned follow:

MANIFESTO—THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF SOVIET AGGRESSION AGAINST THE BALTIC STATES BY FREE ESTONIANS, LATVIANS, AND LITHUANIANS

Twenty-five years ago, in connivance with Hitler's Germany, the Soviet Union attacked the Baltic States. Some 300,000 Red army troops poured into Lithuania on June 15, 1940, and into Latvia and Estonia, on June 17, 1940. With the assistance of the occupation army, the emissaries of the Kremlin—Dekanozov, Vishinsky, Zhdanov—unseated the legitimate governments of the Baltic States. The Baltic countries were robbed of their independence and transformed into colonies of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union's assault against its Baltic neighbors initiated the Soviet westward march against Europe. The beginnings of today's international tension and threat

to peace may thus be found in the Soviet aggression against the Baltic States in 1940.

By its aggressive acts against Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, the U.S.S.R. broke the peace and nonaggression treaties it had signed with those states as well as other international agreements.

Expropriation, exploitation, pauperization, slave labor, suppression of human rights and fundamental freedoms, Russification, terror, murder, mass deportations—these are the marks of the Soviet occupation in the Baltic States. In committing and continuing these acts, the Soviets violated the United Nations Declaration, the Atlantic Charter, the United Nations Charter, the Convention on the Suppression of Crimes of Genocide, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights—all these documents bearing the signature of the U.S.S.R.

The Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian peoples, historically and traditionally Western in orientation and outlook, have consistently placed their hopes in the Western World. Their trust in the West was strengthened by the declaration of the U.S. Department of State of July 23, 1940; the statement of the President of the United States on October 15, 1941; the Atlantic Charter, the Yalta Declaration on Liberated Europe; the repeated statements by the U.S. Government about nonrecognition of the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States, the continued recognition of free Baltic diplomatic representatives by the United States as well as many European and South American Governments; and the proclaimed aims and principles of the United Nations.

At the same time the hopes of the Baltic peoples have been strengthened by the global process of decolonization and the universal acceptance of the right of self-determination of nations. The liberation movement of the colonial peoples in Africa and Asia has helped to expose Soviet colonialism as well and has raised the hopes of captive Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians. They are convinced that the tide of emancipation from colonial rule will not stop at the borders of the Baltic countries.

The Baltic peoples have given active expression to their determination to regain freedom, and have resisted their oppressors, thus contributing greatly to the continuing struggle for freedom and justice being waged by all captive peoples enslaved by the Soviet Union. Despite heavy setbacks and trials, our peoples maintain their faith in the restoration of their freedom and independence.

This summer the Soviet enslavers will unveil a macabre spectacle—a festive celebration of the 25th anniversary of the enslavement of the Baltic States during which the captive Baltic peoples will be coerced to appear grateful to their conquerors.

We—free Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians—are conscious of our responsibility toward our nations and to history. At this 25th anniversary of Soviet aggression, we feel dutybound to give voice to the will and the aspirations of our captive peoples:

We accuse the Soviet Union of committing and continuing an international crime against the Baltic States;

We demand that the Soviet Union withdraw its military, police, and administrative personnel from the Baltic countries;

We request that the governments of the free world, especially those of the great powers, use all peaceful ways and means to restore the exercise of the right to self-determination in the Baltic countries and in the rest of east-central Europe;

We further request that the United Nations De-Colonization Committee immediately fulfill its overdue duty and take up the case of Soviet colonialism in the Baltic States;

We appeal to the conscience of all mankind to perceive the magnitude of the in-

justice perpetrated upon the Baltic peoples and to support the efforts toward the restoration of liberty to these countries;

We convey to our people at home our pride in their resolute resistance against the endeavors of the oppressor to destroy their national and personal identity;

We share with our captive compatriots their view that the recent Soviet economic, political, and ideological setbacks—inherent in the structure of their totalitarian system—have considerably weakened the Soviet Union and thus raised the hopes of the captives for deliverance;

We pledge to intensify our joined organized activity in the free world to promote the cause of liberty for the Baltic countries;

We finally declare to the free world and the Communist-dominated world, including the U.S.S.R., that, once free again, the Baltic Nations will do all in their power to insure the best possible relations with their neighbors on the basis of mutual respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity.

BALTIC STATES FREEDOM COUNCIL

Chairman: Vaclovas Sidzikauskas, president, Supreme Committee for Liberation of Lithuania, chairman, Committee for a Free Lithuania.

Deputy chairman: Aleksander Kütt, chairman, Committee for a Free Estonia.

Deputy chairman: Vilis Hazners, chairman, Committee for a Free Latvia.

Members: Mrs. Gundega Michel, chairman, Latvian Student World Association; Dr. Peter Lejins, Jr., chairman, Latvian Free World Federation; Olev M. Piirsalu, president, Estonian World Council; Peep Rebassoo, president, Estonian Student Association in the United States; Juozas Bachunas, president, Lithuanian World Congress; and Algis Zaprackas, chairman, Lithuanian Students Association.

NEW YORK, N.Y., June 1965.

SOVIET SEIZURE AND OCCUPATION OF LITHUANIA

History: The Lithuanians have inhabited their territory on the eastern shore of the Baltic Sea since time immemorial. With a population of over 3 million, Lithuania's area is 25,160 square miles—larger in size than Switzerland, Belgium, or Denmark. Bounded by east Prussia, Poland, Russia, Latvia, and the Baltic Sea, prior to World War II Lithuania had no common border with the U.S.S.R. because Poland had invaded and occupied the Vilnius area, including the capital city of Vilnius.

In the year 1251 Pope Innocent IV crowned Mindaugas King of Lithuania, the ancient country adopted Christianity and was thereafter ruled by grand dukes until, at the end of the 18th century, czarist Russia conquered and ruled Lithuania. The Lithuanian nation then had to endure 120 years (1795–1915) of Russian subjugation, during which there were two major Lithuanian uprisings.

Restoration of independence: As World War I was ending and coincidental with U.S. President Wilson's proclamation of the right of all nations to self-determination, the Lithuanian National Council, as the representative body of the Lithuanian nation, on February 16, 1918, proclaimed Lithuania a free and independent democratic republic.

Between 1918 and 1922 Lithuania was recognized de jure by all the great powers including the United States (on July 28, 1922), as well as the other nations of the world, and on September 22, 1921, became a member of the League of Nations.

Following the revolution in Russia in 1918 Soviet Russian troops tried to invade and occupy Lithuania, but the Lithuanian volunteer army repulsed all the Bolshevik attacks.

Treaties: On July 12, 1920, the Soviet Union signed a Treaty of Peace with the

Republic of Lithuania, by which the Soviets solemnly agreed:

"Russia, without any reservation whatsoever, recognizes Lithuania as a self-governing and independent state with all juridical consequences that follow from such a recognition and in a spirit of free and good will renounces for all time all sovereignty rights of Russia concerning the Lithuanian nation and the Lithuanian territory."

Then on September 28, 1926, the Republic of Lithuania and the U.S.S.R. entered into a treaty of nonaggression which among other things stipulated:

"The Republic of Lithuania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics mutually undertake to respect in all circumstances the sovereignty and territorial integrity and inviolability of each other."

In April 1934 this agreement was extended until December 31, 1945.

Another agreement to which Lithuania and the Soviet Union were signatories was the Convention for the Definition of Aggression signed in 1933, which set forth that:

"An aggressor in an international conflict, without prejudice to the agreement in force between the parties in conflict, shall be recognized as the state which shall first commit any one of the following acts:

"1. Declaration of war against another state.

"2. Invasion by its armed forces, even without declaration of war, of the territory of another state.

"3. Attack by its land, naval, or air forces, even without a declaration of war, against the territory of another state.

"4. No considerations of a political, military, economic, or any other order shall serve as an excuse or justification for any aggression * * *

Finally, when Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany had partitioned Poland shortly after the outbreak of World War II, the Soviet Union on October 10, 1939, imposed upon Lithuania a mutual assistance pact which included the right for the U.S.S.R. to establish military bases and the entry of unlimited numbers of Red army troops in Lithuania, even though the pact specifically stated:

"The realization of this treaty must not infringe the sovereign rights of the contracting parties, especially the structure of their state, their economic and social systems, military instruments and altogether the principle of nonintervention of one state in the internal affairs of the other state."

All of these treaties and pacts provided for peaceful coexistence, nonaggression against one another, noninterference in one another's affairs, and guaranteed each other's independence and territorial integrity. By these treaties and agreements, the Soviet Union recognized and guaranteed Lithuania's independence and territorial integrity. On her part, Lithuania implicitly abided by these agreements and always maintained friendly relations with Soviet Russia.

The Communist Party was not a legal political party in Lithuania and, as facts later disclosed, consisted of between 600 to 1,000 members, who received their instructions and directives from the Party center in Moscow.

Soviet-Nazi conspiracy: Despite the apparently friendly relations, the Soviet Union was secretly plotting the seizure and annexation of the Republic of Lithuania. Military maps of the Soviet Russian General Staff published in 1939 already showed Lithuania as a Soviet Republic.

Preparing for its attack on Poland, Nazi Germany on August 23, 1939 signed a non-aggression pact with Soviet Russia, then 1 month later, on September 28, 1939, after partitioning Poland, amended this pact with a secret protocol agreeing to have Lithuania fall completely into the Soviet sphere "as

soon as the Government of the U.S.S.R. shall take special measures on Lithuanian territory to protect its interests" (State Department bulletin, Nazi-Soviet relations 1939-40).

The military invasion and occupation of Lithuania and the suppression of all freedoms by the Soviets were a direct consequence of the secret agreement between the Soviet Union and Hitler Germany (the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact) signed in 1939.

Ultimatum and military invasion: Before carrying out its preplanned occupation and annexation, the Soviet Union accused the Government of Lithuania of various trumped-up unfriendly acts. Finally, on June 14, 1940, Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs V. Molotov presented a Soviet ultimatum to the Lithuanian Government making the following demands:

(a) To bring to trial the Minister of the Interior, K. Skucas, and the Director of Department of Security, A. Povilaitis.

(b) To form a new government in Lithuania, satisfactory to the Soviets.

(c) To assure free entry into Lithuania of unlimited numbers of Soviet Russian armed forces.

The deadline for the reply of the Lithuania Government was set at 10 a.m. of June 15, allowing scarcely 10 or 11 hours for consideration of the ultimatum.

On June 15, 1940, at 2 in the afternoon, Lithuanian's Minister of Foreign Affairs J. Urbys sent a telegram from Moscow explaining that the Soviet Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars and Foreign Commissar Molotov had presented a detailed plan as to how the Soviet Army units, with the purpose of occupying Lithuania, would proceed.

About 12 complete divisions, from 200,000 to 250,000 soldiers, swamped Lithuania whose peacetime armed forces totaled only about 28,000 soldiers.

Imposition of puppet regime: Once the Red army was in Lithuania, "revolution by the army" was an accomplished fact. The first step was the formation of a Soviet-puppet government. Soviet Vice Commissar for Foreign Affairs V. G. Dekanozov came by plane to Kaunas, set up headquarters in the Soviet Legation, and assisted by Soviet Envoy Pozdniakov, began to rule the country in accordance with the orders he had brought with him from Moscow.

Dekanozov's first task was the formation of a "new government," one obedient to Moscow. He dictated the names of new ministers to the Acting Prime Minister, A. Merkys. Justas Paleckis, who had previous contacts with the Soviet Union, was to be named President of the republic. To allay the fears of Lithuania's people, several prominent Lithuanian patriots were purposely included in the list of new ministers.

Order elections: Pursuing Moscow's plan for Lithuania's subjugation, the Kremlin agents made Paleckis' government proclaim on July 6, 1940, a law governing the elections to the so-called People's Diet to be held on July 14.

A July 7 order by the Director of the State Security Department dissolved all non-Communist Parties, and ordered the arrest of most of their leaders and active members.

The Communist Party was the only recognized party, assuming the name, "The Union of Working People of Lithuania," to mislead the people. Only this union was allowed to nominate candidates for the elections.

Seventy-nine members were to be elected to the People's Diet, and 79 candidates were nominated by the Communist Party and its affiliated organization exclusively. Thus Communists and their sympathizers, some of them persons of no repute or standing, were listed. A few well-known Lithuanians became candidates against their will as their names were listed without their knowledge

or consent, again in order to mislead the voters.

The fictitious Union of Working People proclaimed to the Lithuanian nation its political platform which, among other promises, said:

"On this historic day, July 14, we must go to the polls in united and closed ranks and elect the worthy candidates able to express the real will and aspirations of the people and to strengthen the true friendship with the great Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which is the one and only guarantee for the prosperity and free development of our country."

Mockery of the people's will: Supported by Red army units, Russian agents staged mock Communist-style "elections" on July 14 and "elected" a new Diet (National Assembly) which on July 21 as its first order of business voted to petition the Kremlin to accept Lithuania as one of the republics of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet in Moscow on August 3 decreed that Lithuania was to be "accepted" into Soviet Union.

Still following the friendly secret agreement of 1939, the Soviet Union in the early part of 1941 paid Hitler \$7,500,000 for his "share of the loot" (Lithuanian territory).

Lithuanian revolt: With the outbreak of the Soviet-Nazi war on June 22, 1941, the Lithuanians spontaneously revolted against the Soviet occupants and, even as the Bolsheviks were being driven out of Lithuania, proclaimed the restoration of the Independent Republic of Lithuania and the formation of a provisional government. Nazi Germany, however, being a harsh aggressor, had no intention of allowing such a situation to exist and after 1 month disbanded the Provisional Lithuanian Government and imposed its own occupation regime.

True facts of incorporation: Once the country was cleared of the Bolshevik occupants, former members of the Soviet-formed puppet "people's diet" made a public statement which explained how the Bolsheviks had by force and subterfuge "enacted" Lithuania's "incorporation" into the U.S.S.R.:

"Meeting at Kaunas on August 30, 1942, we, members of the former Soviet Lithuanian Government and the people's diet, publicly state:

"1. In violation, by use of force and threats, of the solemn pledges given to the Republic of Lithuania to respect, in all circumstances her 'sovereignty and territorial integrity', the Government of the Soviet Union, on June 15, 1940, occupied Lithuania by its armed forces:

"2. The Lithuanian Government which was created according to the demands of the Moscow ultimatum and which had obtained the assurances that the independence of Lithuania would be respected, under new pressure from Moscow, was later reorganized, without the knowledge or consent of the Acting Prime Minister, Prof. V. Kreve-Mickievicius, securing its majority for the Communists, headed by M. Gedvila, making it a tool in Moscow's hands.

"3. Moscow ordered the 'reorganized' Lithuanian Government to carry out elections to the 'People's Diet' which was to later request the incorporation of Lithuania into the U.S.S.R.

"4. The 'People's Diet' could not and did not proclaim the will of the Lithuanian people because:

"(a) The 'People's Diet' was made up in advance by the Communist Party, as directed by Moscow's representative V. G. Dekanozov and Soviet Minister to Lithuania N. G. Pozdniakov. Only the Union of Working People of Lithuania was allowed to nominate candidates selected by the Communist Party. The number of candidates was exactly the number of members to be 'elected' to the People's Diet.

"(b) In order to enhance the effect of 'unanimity' it was stated that 95.51 percent of

the electorate had voted; actually, as confirmed by the Supreme Election Commission and by statements made by the former People's Commissar, M. Gedvila, and President of the L.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet J. Paleckis, at secret meetings, only 16 to 18 percent of valid voting cards were submitted at the polls.

"(c) A number of members of the 'Diet', not members of the Communist Party, were compelled by threats to agree to become members of the 'Diet' and to vote for incorporation into the Soviet Union.

"(d) When the voting on the incorporation into the Soviet Union took place the votes of the members were not counted; all strangers present at the session voted along with the Diet.

"5. Not a single member of the People's Diet could express a protest against the use of force as, under the circumstances, such a protest would have involved danger to his life. Moscow's representatives and officials of the Soviet Legation openly threatened all those members of the Diet and their families who would have dared to announce their intention to vote against incorporation in the Soviet Union.

"6. We, former members of the People's Diet, publicly protest against the violence and falsifications directed by the Bolshevik Government against the Republic of Lithuania and the Lithuanian nation during the elections to the Diet as well as during its session. Neither we nor the other members of the Diet could express nor did we express the will of the Lithuanian nation for incorporation into the Soviet Union.

"7. The People's Diet itself stated in its declaration of July 21, 1940, 'Now the people, helped by the mighty Red army * * * established a Soviet Government in their own country. If the people have been able to establish in their own country the only just system, the Soviet system, it is all due to the Soviet Union.' In this way the People's Diet itself admitted the Red army's influence in its decisions and the decisions of other government agencies.

"Former members of the People's Diet: Dr. A. Garmus, L. Dovydenas, H. Kadinskas, B. Juknevičius, V. Birzietis, P. Mickus, Mrs. S. Vainekienė, Miss P. Milancute, the former Acting Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Government, Prof. V. Kreve-Mickevičius, the former Commissar for Social Care and Forest Industry of the L.S.S.R., Jurgis Glusauskas."

Soviet plan to exterminate Lithuanians: After they had gained complete control of Lithuania, the Bolshevik occupants put into operation their plan for the systematic extermination of the Lithuanians. Soviet documents captured after the Soviets fled from Lithuania in 1941 show that the instructions for the gradual extirpation of the Lithuanian nation had been prepared in Moscow in advance of the seizure of the country.

In the 1940-41 period the Soviets imprisoned and deported to Siberian concentration camps approximately 40,000 Lithuanians as was factually documented by the Select Committee on Communist Aggression of the House of Representatives, 83d Congress.

Even though it is difficult to obtain information through the Iron Curtain, on the basis of data published by the Soviets, interviews with persons recently arrived from occupied Lithuania, information contained in letters received abroad, and other sources, it has been possible to learn that during the period from 1944 to 1952, in combat with the Lithuanian partisans (the Soviets admit they killed about 20,000 partisans in pitched battles), by deportations to Siberia, and other means, the Soviet occupation regime has removed or liquidated an estimated 400,000 of Lithuania's inhabitants. These figures would probably be much higher if it were

possible to make a thorough and accurate investigation.

Religion: Lithuania is predominantly a Catholic country. The freedom of religion of which the Soviets boast is a parody, since persecution of the priests and the faithful, the closing of churches and priests seminaries, the ban on religious instruction, and the intense antireligion campaigns have been the rule ever since the Bolsheviks occupied Lithuania.

Economics: Life in Soviet-occupied Lithuania—which was often called "Little America" during its independence—has since the occupation become austere and drab. The prosperous and highly productive farms were nationalized, collectivized into Kolhozes, and agricultural production has fallen to low, typical Soviet levels. Privately owned enterprises and properties have also been confiscated and nationalized, without any compensation to the former owners. The end result of this Sovietization has been the same as in all of Sovietdom—shortage of food and consumer goods. Now hardship and misery are the lot of the people in occupied Lithuania.

Travel restrictions: The Communist occupants do not permit free entry into or exit from Lithuania, nor free travel in the country, nor even free conversation with relatives and/or friends by tourists. The traveler who gains permission to enter Lithuania is automatically assigned a "guide." Most visitors are allowed only a few days' stay in Vilnius; their relatives are brought from their villages to Vilnius to see and talk with them. In the rare exceptions where a person is allowed to travel into the provinces to see his relatives, each such visitor has been accompanied by an official guide companion.

On the whole, the mood of the Lithuanians in Soviet Communist occupied and oppressed Lithuania is one of depression, as they live in the hope of, and anxiously await the time of liberation from the onerous Soviet yoke. They are grateful to the Government and the people of the United States for the just and firm stand of nonrecognition of the illegal Soviet grab of their country, and the continued recognition of independent Lithuania and its diplomatic and consular representatives. The Lithuanians in Lithuania look hopefully and with confidence to the United States and the free Western World for aid in their struggle to again be free and self-governing in their own independent State of Lithuania.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, since 1940 the Baltic States—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—have suffered under the oppression of Soviet rule. Hundreds and thousands of these valiant people have been sent to the cruel Soviet slave-labor camps while others have died at the hands of their Bolshevik masters.

This despotic captivity was not accomplished peacefully but by the force of arms and in violation of numerous international agreements. In 1920, for example, a peace treaty was signed between Lithuania and the Soviet Union in which the latter relinquished all territorial claims on Lithuania and extended its recognition to the National Lithuanian Government. This, theoretically, put an end to the efforts of establishing a Soviet

regime in Lithuania. A further ruse was attempted by the Soviets in the signing of a nonaggression treaty with Lithuania in 1926.

The fate of Lithuania, as well as of the other Baltic States, was sealed in 1939, however, with the signing of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact. Shortly thereafter the Soviet Union imposed upon all the Baltic States pacts of mutual assistance which gave Russia the right to establish various military bases in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. This was accomplished under the threat of direct military action. It was from this time that the cancer of Soviet despotism began to grow in these lands.

The final step was taken on June 15, 1940, when the Red army invaded Lithuania and surrounded the Lithuanian troops.

Under Russian control, elections were then held in the three Baltic States. The purpose of this was to provide Soviet control of these nations, under the cloak of legality, and thus pave the way for Russian annexation.

Apart from Nazi occupation between 1941 and 1944, these valiant people have suffered under the domination of their Soviet despots for 25 years. Every attempt has been made by the Russian propaganda machine to explain that the Soviet control and annexation of the three Baltic countries had been peacefully accomplished by legal means. The nations of the free world, however, have been able to see through this subterfuge and know full well that this is simply another sham in a continuing campaign of deception.

Shortly after the Soviet forces took control of these freedom-loving people, underground resistance organizations were formed and guerrilla action was taken against the Russians. This was a heroic and extensive resistance movement but the Russians mercilessly beat them with a loss of almost 30,000 Lithuanian patriots, not to mention countless others who died in the other two countries.

Mr. Speaker, since the end of the Second World War we have been concerned with the self-determination of the peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. It would sometimes seem, however, that we have forgotten the hopes and aspirations of the heroic people of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania. Their fight against the forces of Communist oppression and domination should be our fight. These nations must be able to throw off the yoke of Soviet tyranny and take their rightful places as full members of the family of free and sovereign nations. As the leader of the free world, it should be our duty to lend whatever assistance we can to these people.

Therefore, I have today introduced a concurrent resolution calling upon the Congress to request the President to bring the Baltic States question before the United Nations and requesting this international body to have the Soviet Union withdraw all Soviet troops and other forces from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, as well as to return to their homes all Baltic exiles and deportees

now being held in various Soviet prisons and slave-labor camps.

While there is no overt action we can take, we must make it fully clear to all freedom-loving peoples that our conscience will not be clear until these nations have regained their free and sovereign status.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I am happy today to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] concerning the unhappy plight of the Baltic nations of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

It is very important that we in the Congress continue to publicize the plight of these people. As far as the Kremlin is concerned, these three nations have ceased to exist as separate entities. Today, in spite of supposed Soviet concern for self-determination, they continue to carry on a ruthless program of "Sovietization" in the Baltic States.

We need only recall that these states were the first victims of the cynical Nazi-Soviet nonaggression pact of 1939. The deportations of the Baltic peoples to Stalin's forced labor camps started in 1940. A conservative estimate would place the number of people so deported at 100,000, during the period 1940-41.

After World War II, the repressions were much worse. From Latvia alone, more than 100,000 people were deported. However, these people did not sit idly by and await their destruction. They fought back from the farms, fields, and woods of their native lands. Savage fighting took place from 1944 to 1950, which took the lives of thousands of Balts as well as uncounted Soviet secret police soldiers.

To this day, the Soviets have continued their policy of trying to break up the ethnic unity of these nations. They have moved in thousands of Great Russians, and resettled still more Balts in the remote reaches of Kazakhstan. Travelers to the Baltic States have noted the large numbers of Russians who are seen in the streets of the larger cities.

Many of us have sponsored resolutions that this Congress request the President of the United States to instruct our United Nations Ambassador to place the question of the Baltic States on the agenda of the United Nations in order that free elections and self-determination be permitted these people. We should continue in this effort. These people desperately need to know of our concern. Some of these people are still in forced labor camps. In spite of some 20 years of Soviet indoctrination, they have not lost their loyalty to their nation. They search in vain for some small ray of hope. It behooves those of us who live in a free America to do what we can to provide that ray of hope.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may ex-

tend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, as sponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 399, I very much appreciate this opportunity of presenting my reasons for having introduced this measure. The resolution requests the President of the United States to bring the Baltic States question before the United Nations and asks the United Nations to request the Soviet Union to withdraw its troops, secret police, and all controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. It also seeks the return to their homes of all Baltic exiles and deportees from Siberia, prisons, and slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union.

It is altogether fitting and proper that the Congress adopt this resolution. The annals of our history are replete with instances where expressions of our concern for peoples in foreign lands, who were the victims of persecution and harassment, were voiced.

It was upon the initiative of the United States that the United Nations came into being. Our advocacy of the cause of justice, freedom, and democracy illumine the pages of history. The resolution which I have introduced would implement and utilize one of the functions of the organization of the United Nations. I should like to point out that the Charter of the United Nations stands for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples.

I believe we should take the lead in placing the plight of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia—the Baltic States—and the suppression of their freedom before the United Nations. It would be an important help in forming world public opinion, which expressed in this way, could materially assist in bringing about steps toward the achievement of independence for these nations.

As is well known, the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia have been suffering in Soviet slavery since June 15, 1940. For the past quarter century the people of those unhappy countries are under the Communist yoke. They were robbed of their freedom and independence by Russian imperialism in its forward thrust toward hoped-for world domination.

As a result of the relentless drive of the Reds, almost 100 million peoples in all the "captive nations" were deprived of all human rights and fundamental freedoms. Alien regimes were imposed upon them and maintained solely by the presence or threats of intervention by the cruel hordes of the Communist armies. A total war is being waged against the cultures of the captive peoples with a view to distorting or destroying their individual and national identity.

Centuries ago on the eastern shore of the Baltic the Lithuanians, Estonians, and Latvians first founded their kingdoms and lived in peace with their neighbors. Now those countries are darkened under the shadow of foreign military might and their people, whose

heritage has maintained the cause of freedom and liberty for centuries, are the enslaved victims of Soviet aggression.

The evil forces of atheistic communism are pushing the colonization and Russification of the Baltic States through deportation of the natives from their respective homelands, denial of cultural freedoms, and by Russian control of the political life and government.

The late Winston Churchill in his great work entitled "The Second World War" stated:

We have never recognized the 1940 frontiers * * * They were acquired by acts of aggression in shameful collusion with Hitler. The transfer of the * * * Baltic States to Soviet Russia * * * would be contrary to all principles for which we are fighting this war and would dishonor our cause.

In recognition of the right of a free people to national self-determination, the U.S. Government has firmly and consistently stood by its declared policy of nonrecognition of the forcible incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union.

The United States thereby not only accords recognition to the Baltic States people's devotion to the cause of freedom and national independence, but expresses its firm confidence that their cause is just and will ultimately prevail.

In considering the resolution I introduced, one should remember that the suffering of the people of the Baltic States since the early part of World War II marks one of the grimmest chapters of modern times.

It is indeed difficult for us to fully comprehend the enormity of outrages inflicted upon the innocent people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. The flights of families before the Communist and Nazi invading armies, the vengeance of the conquering military might against their patriotic resistance, the mass deportations of helpless men, women and children, the mass executions and murders—these and a thousand cruel inhumanities were all heaped upon the peoples of these small Baltic countries. I will not take up the time of this body to repeat what is already well known regarding the tortures, imprisonment, and tyranny of the ruthless Red taskmasters who obey the mandates issued from Moscow.

Our own country was founded upon Judean-Christian ideals of justice, freedom and self-determination. We, therefore, cannot—we must not—with a clear conscience turn our backs on the serious plight of our fellow human beings in the Baltic countries.

In this connection the words of President Lyndon B. Johnson are of particular significance; he said:

The American covenant called on us to help show the way for the liberation of man. That is still our goal. Thus, if as a nation there is much outside our control, as a people no stranger is outside our hope.

We here in the Congress can show to the world that we do more than just hope for the less fortunate peoples of enslaved nations. We can do this by the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 399, which I introduced.

BALTIC STATES: A COMMEMORATION

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STANTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, on this 25th anniversary of the seizure of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union two indisputable facts should be kept in mind. One fact is that we should never forget that the Baltic States were once free and independent nation-states. And secondly, we should never forget that the Baltic States were the victim of brutal Soviet aggression.

During the interwar period the Baltic States had enjoyed the international status of independent nation-states. World powers recognized these states and carried on normal diplomatic relations with them. Baltic statesmen played important roles in international affairs; they conducted diplomacy for their governments; and in so doing they concluded diplomatic agreements with many nations of the world. In a word, the Baltic States assumed their responsibilities to the international community of nations, and within the measure of their power they performed their tasks nobly hoping always to achieve their national interests while at the same time striving to build a new world order of peace.

On the domestic scene the Baltic States peoples had built strong and vigorous economic and social orders. They developed and expanded their cultural interests, and in the realm of religion recognized the important democratic principle of religious freedom. In the political realm all had built political institutions to suit their own national purposes.

Baltic independence came to an end in June 1940, just 25 years ago. It came to an end when the Soviet Union dispatched its army across the borders, occupied the area, established puppet regimes, and finally annexed the territories to the U.S.S.R. as constituent republics.

That the Soviet Union is guilty of aggression in this entire undertaking goes without saying. In a most brutal manner the Soviets destroyed every contractual engagement that existed between the Soviet Union and the Baltic States. And, Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that in many of these important agreements the Soviet Union acknowledged and reaffirmed the national independence and territorial integrity of the Baltic States.

On this 25th anniversary of the Soviet seizure of the Baltic States the world is reminded once again of the great misfortune that had befallen these truly heroic people. Let us, therefore, pay special tribute to these Baltic peoples, and let us hope that their national tragedy can be a lesson for all freemen who fail to evaluate properly the goals and purposes of world communism.

THE RAPE OF THE BALTIC REPUBLICS BY THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Illinois [Mr. SCHISLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, the date of June 14 has special significance. It was 25 years ago today that three Baltic nations were illegally seized and occupied by the Soviet Union.

Russia has been the curse of her neighbors during its modern history. And the Russian government, both czarist and Communist, has been particularly harsh to the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

For more than a century, prior to the First World War, these peoples suffered under the czarist Russian rule. In 1918, when the detested regime of the czars ended, they regained their cherished and long-deserved independence. In a relatively short time during the inter-war years, they became a progressive and decisive force for peace and prosperity in northeastern Europe. They worked hard, rebuilt their war-ravaged countries, and were more prosperous than their Russian neighbor to the East. Soviet leaders were not only jealous of their prosperity and democratic governments, but they were resolved to put an end to the independence of these peoples, by force if necessary.

Very early in the last war the Soviets, in violation of both treaty and international law, carried out their threat. In mid-1940 the three republics were attacked and overrun by the Red Army. All three were annexed by the Soviet Union. Since 1960 the Soviet Union has claimed these countries as her own, even though the free world refuses to recognize a government which has been illegally seized.

I am happy to say that we have stood firm in our feelings. The United States of America refuses to admit the seizure of these countries as legal and continues to extend diplomatic recognition to the former democratic governments of these countries.

Today, 25 years later, the people of this country reaffirm the Wilsonian principle of self-determination and condemn the annexation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania by the Soviet Union.

LITHUANIAN TRAGEDY IN 1940

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian people had enjoyed freedom and independence in their homeland for only two decades, during the interwar years, when they were robbed of their most precious possessions and enslaved by the Soviet Union. These vigorous and intelligent people who had bravely withstood many ruthless adversaries in the course of their long history, were in no position to face the ferocity of Communist Russia's Red army in 1940. And the men in the Kremlin knew this. They

also knew that while the Lithuanian people had friends and supporters in the West, most of them were involved in the war and unable to help the Lithuanians.

Early in 1940 Lithuania was attacked by the Red army, and in a short time independent Lithuania had ceased to exist. The country was quickly overrun, and many Lithuanian leaders who could not escape were arrested by Soviet authorities. These arrests and imprisonments extended to all ranks and classes of the people, and before long Lithuanians by the tens of thousands were imprisoned. Then all those apprehended and under arrest were placed into freight cars and deported to Asiatic parts of the Soviet Union. Thus began, early in 1940, the illegal seizure of Lithuania by the Soviet Union, and the enslavement and deportation of Lithuanians 25 years ago.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the three Baltic states, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, constitute a distinct unit in Europe, and their citizens are distinguished for their ruggedness and bravery, and possessing the tenacity for clinging to certain ideals. Their time-honored national traditions, their Christian faith, and the spirit of freedom have for centuries been the sinews of their spiritual sustenance.

Both in the days of their independent existence, and during long periods of subjugation to foreign rule, they held fast to these ideals. Under the czarist Russian regime they were the most progressive, the most enlightened, and among the most democratic ethnic elements in that heterogeneous empire. Their sound local economy, their zeal for advancement, and their superior educational institutions and attainments were envied not only in Russia, but also in many parts of Europe. These countries were for more than 100 years Russia's show windows in the West.

At the end of the First World War all three countries broke away from the shattered Russian empire, and proclaimed their independence. In a relatively short time, all three became respected members of the world community of nations. Their loyal and industrious citizens began to rebuild their war-torn countries, and in the course of two decades, these three Baltic democratic republics became a definite force for progress and peace in northeastern European affairs. Though on the east there was the new Communist giant, and on the south there emerged the saberrattling Nazis, for two decades the leaders in these small countries managed to stave off all impending dangers, and kept their independent status, even when they were almost completely isolated from the powerful democracies in Western Europe. In the late 1930's, however, it was evident that alone they could not cope with the dangers threatening their independence and their existence as free

nations. It was clear that neither Communist totalitarianism nor Hitler's nazism would tolerate the democratic luxuries represented in these three small countries.

It is to the credit and everlasting glory of the leaders of these small countries that they withstood all sorts of blandishments and blackmail tactics of their ruthless adversaries, until early in the last war they were physically overwhelmed by brute force. Early in 1940 the Red army overran and then occupied these countries, and finally all three were annexed to the Soviet Union. Then began the enslavement of these peoples under Soviet communism. Since those tragic days there have been world-rocking changes in diplomacy. But during all that time, for 25 years, the fate of the Baltic peoples has been most tragic.

When the Red army swooped over these countries, hundreds of thousands of innocent and inoffensive people were rounded up, packed in freight cars and shipped off to the distant parts of the Soviet Union. The rest were regimented under the Communist system and led a miserable, unenviable life. Today the Soviet Union holds these countries by force and their citizens are held down by all the brute strength at its disposal. There some 5 million innocent and helpless people suffer under Communist tyranny. And that tyranny shows no mercy for those who are suspected of dreaming of freedom and independence. These are instantly seized, tried, and found guilty of counterrevolutionary charges, and, of course, then shipped off to Siberia. Even under such constant harassment, arrests and tortures, imprisonments and exile from their homelands, these Baltic peoples have tenaciously clung to their ideals; they have kept up their hope for freedom.

I am happy to state that the illegal seizure and forced captivity of these Baltic nations by the Soviet Government have never been admitted by the Government of this country, and we continue officially to ignore that illegal and criminal act of the Soviet Government. We are most earnestly and seriously concerned with the fate of these Baltic peoples. We would like to help them in every possible way. I personally have shown my keen interest in their fate by urging, through House Resolution 14, the establishment of a Special House Committee to study the fate of all captive nations. On the 25th anniversary observance of the enslavement of these captive peoples, I once more urge the setting up such a committee, in the fond hope that its work will prove an effective factor in bringing about the liberation of these peoples.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, today, June 14, marks an anniversary of

infamy. It is an appropriate time for all of us to think about the world situation, to think about what we in the United States are doing and what we should be doing to preserve freedom in the world, and to restore freedom to those once free.

Just 25 years ago, the godless hordes of communism seized the Baltic countries of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. They marched in, in violation of international law, in violation of specific treaties with each of these nations.

Since then, there has been brutality, suppression of freedoms, and oppressive forcing of Communist teachings on the people of these countries. Many have been moved to Soviet slave camps; Russians have moved in to take over their property.

This is communism at work. It makes one wonder about the mental capacity of those who urge that we appease this atheistic, cancerous ideology and its ruthless practitioners. It makes one wonder just what a cease-fire treaty in Vietnam would buy, except a worthless promise from an unscrupulous foe, who has demonstrated that treaties are only devices to gain time and advantage.

Perhaps, at this moment, we cannot rescue those brave people now under the heel of communism in the Baltic lands. But we can and must prevent those not now under communism from falling into its iron maiden grasp. On this 25th anniversary of perfidy and international dishonor, we as free Americans should renew our determination to meet our obligation to freedom, and pay no heed to those who advocate tolerance and acceptance of Communists as responsible world citizens.

The record has shown that they have not earned the respect of mankind. As long as any people remain in servitude, the rest of the world is in danger; for the aim and the goal, the intent and purpose, the methods and means, will always remain the same for Communists. Deceit is a weapon that we cannot afford to give them the luxury of utilizing when dealing with the fate of millions of people.

The present administration has accepted the dismemberment of the Balkans as an irreversible fact. It should not be so. The defeat of communism in Asia will serve to hasten the disintegration of communism in Europe. To that end, we should at this time rededicate our national purpose and individual resolve.

SOVIET SEIZURE AND CAPTIVITY OF THE BALTIC NATIONS

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the three ethnic groups with a total population of about 5 million constitute the Baltic nations—the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians. All three had been subjected to Russia's czarist regime since the late

1880's, and they all had retained their love of freedom and independence for more than a century. After the First World War they proclaimed their freedom and reconstituted themselves as independent, sovereign nations. Soon they were admitted into the family of nations, and for two decades they became progressive, democratic republics, a real force for peace in northeastern Europe. They worked hard at the risk of rebuilding and strengthening their respective countries and, considering the relatively short time and the difficult circumstances, they accomplished wonders. In every field of human activity they made startling advances, and in many ways they were regarded as model democratic states.

During all that time their inveterate and implacable foe was watching their progress and prosperity with jealousy and envy. The power-hungry rulers in the Kremlin had their evil designs on these nations. They wanted to put an end to democracy there, annex these countries, and enslave their innocent but helpless inhabitants. The men of the Kremlin attained their goal very early in the last war. First the governments of these countries were forced to sign mutual defense agreements with the Soviet Union. Then Soviet forces were stationed in all strategic points of these countries. Then, under the flimsy pretext that the governments of these countries were hostile to the Soviet Government, the Red Army attacked Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, overran them, eliminated the democratic governments there, and instituted Soviet-type governments. Finally, in mid-1940, all three countries were annexed to the Soviet Union, and thenceforth ceased to be independent entities.

Thus began the enslavement of these stouthearted but helpless Baltic peoples by the Soviet Government. Besides imposing Soviet communism upon these peoples, several hundreds of thousands were arrested and exiled to distant prison-labor camps in the Soviet Union. To this day the fate of these unfortunate souls is unknown. Perhaps a few thousands of them still linger on, but it is not likely that many of these will ever see their once free homeland. On the 25th anniversary observance of Soviet Union's treacherous and illegal seizure of the Baltic countries, and the enslavement of the Baltic peoples, we ardently hope for the freedom of these peoples.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, at this moment in history when the United States and other free world nations are engaged in fighting Communist aggression, it is particularly timely to commemorate the illegal seizure by the Soviet Union of the Baltic nations 25 years ago.

Violating specific treaties with Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and flouting international law, the Soviet Union seized these lands. The act is a blot on the conscience of the free world, which must be dedicated to the goal of eventually restoring freedom in the captive Baltic nations.

The United States should provide the leadership in restoring freedom of speech, religion, press, and other basic rights for the captive people of these courageous countries.

The determination, strength, and will of our enslaved world neighbors to rid themselves of the Communist yoke should provide dynamic inspiration for free nations which must contain an enemy ideology that threatens freedom almost everywhere in the world.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KING] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago thousands of helpless Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians were taken from their homes, torn from their families, and deported by the Soviet Union to slave-labor camps behind the Iron Curtain. These people were among the first victims of the Second World War; and unfortunately, their suffering and hardship are not over yet.

We, as Americans, have not forgotten the tragedy of those dark days. We cannot forget that the spirit and desire for freedom can never be conquered; and in the hearts of the Baltic people still burns the love of, and desire for, liberty from oppression.

The United States has always been the symbol of freedom to the rest of the world and we have advocated and encouraged the establishment and maintenance of freedom for everyone. We do not intend to deviate from this policy and hope that we will never be lulled into a false sense that all is well in the captive nations just because there appears to be some lessening of tension between our country and the Communist-dominated nations.

I am pleased to join with my colleagues in paying homage to the memory of the Baltic people who suffered and died for their righteous cause and pray for the freedom of those who still survive.

BALTIC STATES: A TRIBUTE

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the summer of 1940 was a summer of discontent for all mankind.

In June of this year we are commemorating the 25th anniversary of the Soviet seizure of the Baltic States. For the peoples of that distant region this was the death knell of their independence. For them the summer of 1940 was a time for national disaster and tragedy.

And the rest of the world? It was on the edge of an abyss. France had fallen. Nazi forces enveloped Scandinavia. Britain was left alone to fend off for herself the enemy that was coming. In the Far East, Japan moved relentlessly from one aggression to another. And while all

this turmoil beset this terribly troubled world, we in the United States—at least some of us, and happily the great majority—sought desperately to prepare ourselves for the test of arms that was looming on the horizons.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the summer of 1940 was, indeed, a summer of discontent for all of us; and who is there to tell us that this summer of 1965 will bring to humanity assurances that the world will ever be spared the turmoil and trouble we have beheld in these last 25 years. The world is consumed by crises that offer no solace to us. Yet, we Americans are men of hope and men of reason; we are creatures of the age of enlightenment. We cannot despair of man's condition; nor can we despair of man's capacity to resolve the problems that overwhelm him. And if ever there was a source of encouragement to us all, that source is the example of the Baltic peoples who, after 25 years of the most oppressive tyranny, still hold fast to their national values and hold fast to the expectation that one day in the future freedom will once again come to their land.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, it has been 25 years now since the Soviet Union broke its treaties with the Baltic nations of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia and seized them by force of arms. During this period the Communists have pursued a ruthless policy to destroy systematically the identity of these areas. At first the leaders of the countries were brutally murdered, and since then hundreds of thousands of the people have been deported to labor camps in Siberia and have been replaced by Russians sent into the Baltic areas. Accompanied by political deceit and deception, the Sovietizing of the Baltic States has been a classic example of the Communist pattern for annihilating another nation.

The peoples of these little states have never accepted this conquest of their homelands, and exiles from the Baltic States have remained united behind efforts to restore their countries to freedom. To our credit, our Government has never recognized these seizures of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union and continues to maintain diplomatic relations with representatives for the former governments of these countries.

But in an era when we have aided and urged freedom and independence for scores of small nations throughout the world, our Government should be doing more about the plight of the Baltic States. These are peoples of countries existing for 700 years, and their claims of self-determination are as strong and valid as any in the world. I have introduced a concurrent resolution in this Congress setting forth the steps we should take. The resolution declares "the suppression of freedom is an invitation to violence and a threat to peace," and "involuntary enslavement cannot be encouraged or sanctioned by the United States and other nations subscribing to principles of freedom."

The resolution continues that it is the sense of Congress that the President should instruct the U.S. mission to the United Nations to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Na-

tions and urge that the Soviets withdraw all Soviet troops, colonists, and controls from the Baltic States, return all Baltic exiles from Siberian prisons and slave labor camps, and agree to free elections in the Baltic States under supervision of the United Nations.

I believe this is an issue on which the Congress should urge the administration to act and I hope the Committee on Foreign Affairs will soon give consideration to this resolution.

TWO TRAGIC ANNIVERSARIES

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, next Monday and Tuesday the world will observe two tragic anniversaries. They are the 25th anniversary of the illegal Soviet occupation of Lithuania on June 15, 1940, and the 24th anniversary of the first mass deportations from Lithuania and the other Baltic States on June 14, 1941.

Since I will be out of the United States on official business on those dates, I wish to take this opportunity to express some thoughts on those days of infamy.

Our hearts go out to the freedom-loving people of the Baltic Republics—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—when we recall the terrible bondage into which they were delivered through the hostile acts of their neighboring nation, the Soviet Union.

These people have been subjected to the iron rule of Soviet imperialism. Their countries were forcibly incorporated into the U.S.S.R. and their individual freedoms were denied by the alien philosophy of communism.

But despite their tragic fate, the people of the Baltic States have never lost their fierce desire for liberty and are hopeful that the yoke of Communist oppression will one day be lifted from their homelands.

It is my belief that the political, religious, and cultural freedom of the Baltic peoples should be a continuing objective of the U.S. foreign policy.

One way in which we implement this objective is by retaining official diplomatic recognition of those countries as sovereign nations, with the representatives of the people of exile.

A second is by continuing to bring the Soviet Union before the bar of world opinion at every opportunity—in the United Nations and elsewhere—to answer for the subjugation of these independent states.

A third way of calling attention to this sorry situation is by recalling such days of infamy as June 15, 1940, and June 14, 1941. In doing so we remind all Americans—not simply those whose ancestors or who themselves came from those unhappy countries—that the Baltic States once enjoyed those freedoms which we so cherish.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I wish to once again add my voice to the growing chorus of those who support courses of action designed to roll back the floodwaters of communism which have inundated three small, but sovereign, nations.

Someday, we know, freedom will again dawn over the Baltic for these oppressed peoples. The Baltic Republics once again will take their rightful places in the family of free nations.

This is our devout wish and our earnest prayer to the Almighty.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, for 25 years the people of the Baltic nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have lived without freedom. At a time in history when national self-determination is vigorously expressed the world over, it is imperative that we recognize the profound injustice that has been perpetrated upon the courageous peoples of the Baltic States.

The determination of these nations to wrest freedom from their Soviet captors is expressed in a resolution of the Baltic States Freedom Council which I bring to the attention of the House Members today. Their 25-year effort should be an example for all nations of the world that time will not erode the relentless pursuit of freedom by a resolute people:

MANIFESTO: THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF SOVIET AGGRESSION AGAINST THE BALTIC STATES BY FREE ESTONIANS, LATVIANS, AND LITHUANIANS

Twenty-five years ago, in connivance with Hitler's Germany, the Soviet Union attacked the Baltic States. Some 300,000 Red army troops poured into Lithuania on June 15, 1940, and into Latvia and Estonia, on June 17, 1940. With the assistance of the occupation army, the emissaries of the Kremlin—Dekanozov, Vishinsky, Zhdanov—unseated the legitimate governments of the Baltic States. The Baltic countries were robbed of their independence and transformed into colonies of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union's assault against its Baltic neighbors initiated the Soviet westward march against Europe. The beginnings of today's international tension and threat to peace may thus be found in the Soviet aggression against the Baltic States in 1940.

By its aggressive acts against Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, the U.S.S.R. broke the peace and nonaggression treaties it had signed with those states as well as other international agreements.

Expropriation, exploitation, pauperization, slave labor, suppression of human rights and fundamental freedoms, Russification, terror, murder, mass deportations—these are the marks of the Soviet occupation in the Baltic States. In committing and continuing these acts, the Soviets violated the United Nations Declaration, the Atlantic Charter, the United Nations Charter, the Convention on the Suppression of Crimes of Genocide, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights—all these documents bearing the signature of the U.S.S.R.

The Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian peoples, historically and traditionally Western in orientation and outlook, have consistently placed their hopes in the Western World. Their trust in the West was strengthened by the Declaration of the U.S. Department of State of July 23, 1940; the statement of the President of the United States on October 15, 1941; the Atlantic Charter; the Yalta Declaration on Liberated Europe; the repeated statements by the U.S. Government about nonrecognition of the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States, the continued recognition of free Baltic diplomatic representatives by the United States as well as many European and South American Governments; and the proclaimed aims and principles of the United Nations.

At the same time the hopes of the Baltic peoples have been strengthened by the global process of decolonization and the universal acceptance of the right of self-determination of nations. The liberation movement of the colonial peoples in Africa and Asia has helped to expose Soviet colonialism as well and has raised the hopes of captive Estonians, Lat-

vians, and Lithuanians. They are convinced that the tide of emancipation from colonial rule will not stop at the borders of the Baltic countries.

The Baltic peoples have given active expression to their determination to regain freedom, and have resisted their oppressors, thus contributing greatly to the continuing struggle for freedom and justice being waged by all captive peoples enslaved by the Soviet Union. Despite heavy setbacks and trials, our peoples maintain their faith in the restoration of their freedom and independence.

This summer the Soviet enslavers will unveil a macabre spectacle—a festive celebration of the 25th anniversary of the enslavement of the Baltic States during which the captive Baltic peoples will be coerced to appear grateful to their conquerors.

We, free Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians, are conscious of our responsibility toward our nations and to history. At this 25th anniversary of Soviet aggression, we feel dutybound to give voice to the will and the aspirations of our captive peoples:

We accuse the Soviet Union of committing and continuing an international crime against the Baltic States;

We demand that the Soviet Union withdraw its military, police, and administrative personnel from the Baltic countries;

We request that the governments of the free world, especially those of the great powers, use all peaceful ways and means to restore the exercise of the right to self-determination in the Baltic countries and in the rest of east-central Europe.

We further request that the United Nations' Decolonization Committee immediately fulfill its overdue duty and take up the case of Soviet colonialism in the Baltic States;

We appeal to the conscience of all mankind to perceive the magnitude of the injustice perpetrated upon the Baltic peoples and to support the efforts toward the restoration of liberty to these countries;

We convey to our people at home our pride in their resolute resistance against the endeavors of the oppressor to destroy their national and personal identity;

We share with our captive compatriots their view that the recent Soviet economic, political, and ideological setbacks—inherent in the structure of their totalitarian system—have considerably weakened the Soviet Union and thus raised the hopes of the captives for deliverance;

We pledge to intensify our joined organized activity in the free world to promote the cause of liberty for the Baltic countries;

We, finally, declare to the free world and the Communist-dominated world, including the U.S.S.R. that, once free again, the Baltic nations will do all in their power to ensure the best possible relations with their neighbors on the basis of mutual respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, during June of this year we are commemorating the anniversary of the conquest of the Baltic States. Twenty-five years ago Soviet armed forces moved across the frontiers of the Baltic States, conquered the area, staged Soviet-style one-slate elections, and formally absorbed the Baltic States into the Soviet Union as constituent republics. All of these events took place within a few short weeks during the summer of 1940. The Baltic peoples were forced to submit to conquest. Many Baltic people were killed and many thousands more were deported to distant areas in the U.S.S.R.

Once the conquest was complete, the process known as Sovietization took place. The Baltic nations were reshaped

according to the model of the Soviet state itself. Private property was brought under the authority of the state; farmlands were collectivized; all aspects of economic life were socialized. The political life of the nation was reshaped along the lines of the classic Communist model. Freedom of dissent was denied, and all autonomous authority, except that permitted by the state, was dissolved.

These were troubled days for the Baltic peoples, and the postwar era has brought no relief to this much disturbed land. The vital national life of the Baltic peoples is now even more seriously threatened by a declared nationality policy that seeks the fusion of all peoples.

On this 25th anniversary of the Soviet conquest of the Baltic States, let us, therefore, pay special tribute to a truly heroic people, a people who look forward to the day when freedom will once again reign in their land.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, to join the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian people in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the occupation of their homelands by the Soviet Union and in memory of the deportations of the citizens of the Baltic countries from their homelands, is an occasion for both sorrow and gratification. The sadness of the occasion is manifest. It is, however, with gratification that we pay tribute to the spirit of the Baltic countries which endures.

Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians the world over have maintained their identity. More than that, they have maintained their ideals and their reputation for a quality of thought, of customs, and traditions which have long helped to lead the civilized world.

This well-deserved reputation is the more remarkable because it has survived hundreds of years, and many of them have been marked by the utmost tribulation. Their centuries-old history of advanced culture is also one of repeated victimization by their neighbors. Despite, however, political, economic, and attempted social ravaging, which has reoccurred countless times during their long history, the people of the Baltic countries have remained ethnically, culturally, and spiritually indomitable.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in this sad observance and commemoration of the illegal seizure of the Baltic States just 25 years ago by the Soviet Union.

A quarter of a century has passed since the freedom and independence of those three small states, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, were so ruthlessly snuffed out by force of arms. It was on June 15, 1940, when the Soviet Union, in connivance with Nazi Germany, sent its Red army hordes into the three defenseless states, unseated their legitimate Governments elected by the people, converted them into colonies of the Soviet Empire, and has kept them subjugated ever since. This was the beginning of the Kremlin's penetration into Europe, which subsequently led to the spread of Communist domination over all of Eastern Europe and parts of central Europe.

During the past 25 years the peoples of the three Baltic States were subjected to extermination and deportation of hundreds of thousands who were sent to slave labor camps. There was continued suppression of religious life in the three countries, the denial of basic human rights, and a systematic policy of Russification aimed to stamp out all cultural life associated with the heritages of the Baltic peoples.

In the United States we have many hundreds of thousands of people of Lithuanian, Latvian, or Estonian descent, who are loyal and devoted Americans. They are a religious element, strong supporters of democracy, and patriotic citizens. They live in peace with their neighbors, are tolerant of other people's views and beliefs, and contribute their share toward America's growth and greatness.

On the occasion of the observance of this tragic event in their history, I join in prayer for the early realization of their dream to see their ancestral homeland free from the yoke of Communist domination. May this long nightmare soon end for the Baltic peoples.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the plight of the three nations, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, which comprise the Baltic States, is of deep and heartfelt concern to all Americans. The tragic fate of these courageous peoples who have been by force incorporated into the Soviet Union in spite of their efforts to overthrow the yoke of Soviet domination, is a constant and continuing challenge to the free world. It is not enough to sympathize with the peoples of the Baltic States in their enslavement by Soviet Russia. It is time that some concrete effort be made to restore national freedom to these countries and to return the right of self-determination to the peoples of the Baltic States.

At the request of many of my constituents in Birmingham who join with me in the belief that the restoration of freedom to those nations now under the domination of communism must be accomplished by active national protest rather than passive words, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 421 which asks that the President of the United States bring the Baltic States question before the United Nations to demand that the Soviet Union withdraw all Soviet troops, secret police, agents, colonists, and all controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and to return to their homes all Baltic exiles and deportees from Siberia, prisons, and slave labor camps in the Soviet Union; and to request that free elections be conducted in the Baltic States under international supervision to return the right of self-determination to the peoples of these states.

The United States has continuously maintained diplomatic relations with the Governments of the free Baltic Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and has refused to recognize their seizure by force by the Soviet Union.

By passage of a resolution as outlined, the Congress of the United States will again proclaim to the world that this Nation and its people are determined

that all peoples everywhere who are seeking release from Communist oppression and tyranny must attain the right of self-determination, and that those nations which so desire must be given an opportunity to freely choose whether they will remain a part of the Soviet bloc, or become again a part of the free world.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues here today in pausing to remember the events which began 25 years ago in the Baltic States and I wish to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] for reserving this time today for this purpose.

It is appropriate that we here in this Congress take note of these events because we are sometimes tempted, I think, to take for granted the democratic institutions with which we are blessed. The events which took place in the Baltic States 25 years ago and which led to the enslavement of millions of freedom-loving peoples make it vividly clear that all of us in the free world must constantly and jealously protect our own liberty.

The illegal occupation of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union is a tragic example of how quickly and devastatingly a free government can be destroyed. It shows that while a man's freedom may be an inalienable right, it is not a right which can be taken for granted or maintained without effort and struggle on our part.

The establishment of puppet governments in the Baltic States and the replacement of officials of the independent governments with Communist dupes was an affront to the freedom-loving peoples of those countries and to every citizen of the free world.

The horrible mass deportations to slave labor camps in Siberia and the separation of families was followed year after year, for these 25 years, by assaults on the human dignity of every Baltic citizen.

We cannot undo the acts of the past years. The horrible events are at best permanent scars on all freemen. But we must resolve to put an end to these denials of liberty. That is why I have joined in introducing a resolution calling for action through the United Nations to regain the independence of these states. I have also introduced a resolution to establish a Committee on Captive Nations here in Congress that would continually focus attention on this serious problem and study the best ways to achieve the goal for which all freemen strive—to regain the independence and sovereignty of the Baltic States.

We learned a lesson 25 years ago. This lesson becomes more firmly impressed with each passing day and year. That lesson is that the Communist governments will take every square foot of free land that is unprotected. The cost of this lesson was high and is still being paid by the suffering of the Baltic peoples.

In Vietnam and the Dominican Republic we are showing today that we did learn this lesson and that we must stand up to the Communists. The cost we pay in defense of free nations is also high,

but I would ask those critics of our policies today if the cost of appeasement is not higher. The cost of human suffering in the Baltic States; 25 years of executions, deportations, slave labor, and the degrading indignities involved in and perhaps the worst part of each.

That cost is too high for any freeman to pay. Men have died in the past and die today because they would rather pay their lives than lose their freedom.

Our fight for freedom would not be finished by victories in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. It must and will continue until all men are free including those courageous people of the Baltic States.

Let us continue to work with renewed strength and determination to make certain that another 25 years do not pass before we can once again speak of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia as fellow members of the family of free nations. We must work to make them free, because no country is an island. While their freedom remains impaired, ours is diminished, too.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, on this, the 25th anniversary of the Soviet Union's illegal seizure of the Baltic nations, it is important that we demonstrate to the people of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, now living under Soviet domination, that we have not forgotten their plight and will not rest until their freedom is restored.

Therefore, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following manifesto by free Estonians, Latvians and Lithuanians:

MANIFESTO: THE TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF SOVIET AGGRESSION AGAINST THE BALTIC STATES, BY FREE ESTONIANS, LATVIANS, AND LITHUANIANS

Twenty-five years ago, in connivance with Hitler's Germany, the Soviet Union attacked the Baltic States. Some 300,000 Red Army troops poured into Lithuania on June 15, 1940, and into Latvia and Estonia, on June 17, 1940. With the assistance of the occupation army, the emissaries of the Kremlin—Dekanozov, Vishinsky, Zhdanov—unseated the legitimate governments of the Baltic States. The Baltic countries were robbed of their independence and transformed into colonies of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union's assault against its Baltic neighbors initiated the Soviet westward march against Europe. The beginnings of today's international tension and threat to peace may thus be found in the Soviet aggression against the Baltic States in 1940.

By its aggressive acts against Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, the U.S.S.R. broke the peace and non-aggression treaties it had signed with those states as well as other international agreements.

Expropriation, exploitation, pauperization, slave labor, suppression of human rights and fundamental freedoms, Russification, terror, murder, mass deportations—these are the marks of the Soviet occupation in the Baltic States. In committing and continuing these acts, the Soviets violated the United Nations Declarations, the Atlantic Charter, the United Nations Charter, the Convention on the Suppression of Crimes of Genocide, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights—all these documents bearing the signature of the U.S.S.R.

The Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian peoples, historically and traditionally Western in orientation and outlook, have consistently placed their hopes in the Western World. Their trust in the West was strengthened by

the Declaration of the U.S. Department of State of July 23, 1940; the statement of the President of the United States on October 15, 1941; the Atlantic Charter; the Yalta Declaration on Liberated Europe; the repeated statements by the U.S. Government about non-recognition of the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States, the continued recognition of free Baltic diplomatic representatives by the United States as well as many European and South American Governments; and the proclaimed aims and principles of the United Nations.

At the same time the hopes of the Baltic peoples have been strengthened by the global process of decolonization and the universal acceptance of the right of self-determination of nations. The liberation movement of the colonial peoples in Africa and Asia has helped to expose Soviet colonialism as well and has raised the hopes of captive Estonians, Latvians and Lithuanians. They are convinced that the tide of emancipation from colonial rule will not stop at the borders of the Baltic countries.

The Baltic peoples have given active expression to their determination to regain freedom, and have resisted their oppressors, thus contributing greatly to the continuing struggle for freedom and justice being waged by all captive peoples enslaved by the Soviet Union. Despite heavy setbacks and trials, our peoples maintain their faith in the restoration of their freedom and independence.

This summer the Soviet enslavers will unveil a macabre spectacle—a festive celebration of the 25th anniversary of the enslavement of the Baltic States during which the captive Baltic peoples will be coerced to appear grateful to their conquerors.

We—free Estonians, Latvians and Lithuanians—are conscious of our responsibility toward our nations and to history. At this 25th anniversary of Soviet aggression, we feel dutybound to give voice to the will and the aspirations of our captive peoples:

We accuse the Soviet Union of committing and continuing an international crime against the Baltic States;

We demand that the Soviet Union withdraw its military, police, and administrative personnel from the Baltic countries;

We request that the governments of the free world, especially those of the great powers, use all peaceful ways and means to restore the exercise of the right to self-determination in the Baltic countries and in the rest of east-central Europe;

We further request that the United Nations' De-Colonization Committee immediately fulfill its overdue duty and take up the case of Soviet colonialism in the Baltic States;

We appeal to the conscience of all mankind to perceive the magnitude of the injustice perpetrated upon the Baltic peoples and to support the efforts toward the restoration of liberty to these countries;

We convey to our people at home our pride in their resolute resistance against the endeavors of the oppressor to destroy their national and personal identity;

We share with our captive compatriots their view that the recent Soviet economic, political, and ideological setbacks—inherent in the structure of their totalitarian system—have considerably weakened the Soviet Union and thus raised the hopes of the captives for deliverance;

We pledge to intensify our joined organized activity in the free world to promote the cause of liberty for the Baltic countries;

We, finally, declare to the free world and the Communist-dominated world, including the U.S.S.R., that, once free again, the Baltic nations will do all in their power to insure the best possible relations with their neighbors on the basis of mutual respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to join my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI], and other Members of the House in saluting the valiant subjugated people of the Baltic nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, who have endured the yoke of communism since it was imposed upon them by the Soviet Union just 25 years ago.

Since those countries fell victim to illegal seizure by an alien power, we in the United States have ourselves come to understand better what communism means. We have had Korea, where the spread of communism is being held in check; we more recently have seen tiny Cuba on our Nation's very doorstep taken over by this modern scourge of mankind; and now we are losing the lives of fellow Americans in the struggle to save South Vietnam, and, yes, even in the Dominican Republic and the rest of the Western Hemisphere we are striving to protect freemen from further Communist conquest and tyranny.

So, as we recall what the Soviet Union did in 1940, seizing those three Baltic countries in flagrant violation of specific treaties and international law, our sympathies for the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania are greater than ever. It is entirely appropriate that we in this Congress should remind the world of how a nation can be forcibly occupied by another in post-World War II days, and how thousands of persons can be deported from their own lands to Communist slave camps—as has been the case of these brave and beleaguered.

If those people had been fortunate enough to have had assistance from the United States such as we have since been able to give to others in widely separated parts of the world, they might still be free today. They and other captive peoples of many nations look to us for their ultimate deliverance and restoration to freedom. We must never allow them to lose hope, nor must we ever stand idly by when the Communist threat hovers over free peoples anywhere.

May God continue to sustain our efforts to regain peace and freedom in this world, and may He give those who are oppressed like the Estonians, Lithuanians, and Latvians the strength and courage to withstand ruthless dominations so that one day they may again enjoy the privilege of self-determination and the more abundant things in life which they are now denied.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, 24 years ago, in June 1941, the Soviet Government launched a tragic wave of deportations from the helpless Baltic nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia unparalleled in its brutality and unmitigated in its heartlessness. In a single night over 15,000 Latvians were exiled to slave labor camps in Siberia. More than 34,000 Lithuanians were deported in 1 week, and 60,000 Estonians were forcibly driven from their homeland in a 1-year period. Many of these people never saw their homelands again. Families were broken up. Thousands were enslaved by the ruthless totalitarian methods of the Soviet Government.

Those who were left behind were little better off, for their native lands were destined to languish under the harsh yoke of Communist domination. It was not the first time that the brave little Baltic republics had been subjected to foreign domination, but this time the loss of liberty was particularly bitter for it was achieved through betrayal of a solemn pledge.

After the First World War the Baltic countries had regained their sovereignty following nearly two centuries of Russian domination and a German takeover during the war period. Under the German-Russian Peace Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, signed on March 3, 1918, and a supplementary agreement of August 27, Russia renounced her sovereignty over the Baltic States. The brave Baltic peoples still had to fight for their independence, however. After Germany's military collapse, the Soviet Union declared the treaty null and void. Only after the Baltic countries fought a successful war of independence against the Red army did the Soviet Union, in 1920, sign peace treaties with each of the Baltic States renouncing "forever" all Russian rights over the Baltic republics.

As is so poignantly proven by the bitter tragedy of the Baltic republics, treaties are mere "scraps of paper" to the Soviet Government, to be disposed of at will when the circumstances are propitious. Even during the peaceful thirties, when the Baltic nations enjoyed a golden age of prosperity in which democratic institutions thrived, art and literature flourished, and economic progress abounded, dark threat of renewed Soviet aggression hovered over them. Several Communist coups were attempted, and there were numerous frontier incidents between the Soviets and the Baltic nations.

Then, as the storm clouds thickened over Europe, in the middle 1930's the Soviet Union began exerting pressure for a protectorate over the Baltic republics, allegedly to secure them from German aggression. The next act in the tragedy was Soviet imposition of mutual defense pacts on the Baltic countries in 1939, the prelude to occupation by the Soviet armies in 1940 and finally "incorporation" of the Baltic republics into the U.S.S.R. Thus, the recognition of independence pledged by the Soviets in 1920 was forgotten 20 years later. The betrayal was insidious and complete.

With incorporation into the U.S.S.R. the cherished liberties of the Baltic peoples vanished. All the sinister symbols of Communist dictatorship—nationalization of the economy, abolition of individual freedoms, repression of political dissent—became apparent in the once proud and independent republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Tragedy upon tragedy followed—terror, arrest, and finally deportation. The spirit of less courageous peoples would have snapped under the burden of their fate, but the Baltic peoples have never given up hope that they may live to see their countries once again become proud and independent nations dedicated to the goals of democracy and world peace.

The Government of the United States has never recognized the Soviet incorporation of any of the three Baltic countries. All Americans share the hopes of the Baltic peoples that one day they will again be free. On this tragic anniversary, we commend their courage and offer our heartfelt prayers for their deliverance from the yoke of Soviet tyranny.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the first 2 days of this week are days of solemn memory in the history of the freedom-loving peoples of the Balkan States. For it was 25 years ago that the Soviet Army swept across the borders of the three neutral Balkan nations and brought them under the yoke of Communist tyranny.

On the 15th of June, Lithuania was overrun; on the 16th Latvia fell; on June 17 Estonia yielded to the barbarian aggressors. In 3 short days, 6 million people lost their cherished independence.

Within a month the Soviet Union established puppet governments which still rule today. From that time terror and crime have been the watchword of the reign of the Soviet oppressors. Countless thousands of citizens in all three states were executed to prevent a resurgence of patriotism, justice, and freedom. One hundred and forty thousand were deported to isolated regions of Russia. Some fortunately were able to flee to Western Europe and forge for themselves new lives in freedom.

Today, when the first objective of citizens of the free world is to keep other nations from falling within the paralyzing influence of the Communists, we must never forget the gallant freedom-loving peoples of the Baltic States who are ever striving to rid themselves of their Communist oppressors.

Let us pray that we might see in our day the liberation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—that one day soon these peoples may once again live under the skies of freedom.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is vitally important that we take note of the continuing struggle for freedom and justice being waged by the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, who were enslaved by the Soviet Union 25 years ago. There is no statute of limitations that applies to the crime committed by the Soviet Union in robbing these countries of their independence.

We must remind ourselves and all freedom loving people that the suppression of human rights and fundamental freedoms of speech, religion, press, and so forth, in the Baltic States stands out as a model of Communist aggression. While we are using our national power directly to support the Vietnamese in defending themselves against such a happening there, we must not abandon the Baltic people who look to us for leadership in the eventual restoration of their freedom.

We are dutybound not to let the passage of time deter us from the repeated assurances by our Government that we support the aspirations of these captive nations. There is a very wide acceptance of the right of self-determination of people and we see in rapid succession former colonial people becoming inde-

pendent. This gives hope and encouragement for eventual deliverance of the captive nations. The Soviet Union is being exposed—while she is depicting herself as the great anticolonialist she continues to subjugate the Baltic nations to the most brutal colonial oppression.

I fully concur with my colleagues that on this 25th anniversary, when the Communists are planning to celebrate what they choose to call the liberation of the Baltic nations we let the world know that their seizure of these lands in violation of specific treaties and international law can never be condoned or considered permanent. The obstinate refusal of these subjugated people to accept tyranny inspires all of us. Let us resolve to use all peaceful ways and means to right the wrongs perpetrated upon the Baltic people and support the efforts toward restoration of their liberties. Surely this should be a continuing objective of U.S. foreign policy.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the woes and sufferings of the Baltic peoples, the peaceful and liberty-loving inhabitants of once independent Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, are known throughout the free world. The free world also knows that their misery and misfortune was brought on by the deliberate machinations of the power-hungry men in the Kremlin. In 1940 all three Baltic republics were forcibly annexed to the Soviet Union and many hundreds of thousands of their inhabitants were uprooted from their homes. These innocent and helpless victims of the Soviet Union's treacherous seizure in 1940 are still suffering in some distant and desolate corner of the Soviet prison empire.

Since then, for nearly 25 years, the free world has heard practically nothing about these unhappy deportees except bits of information obtained from those few who have had the extraordinary luck to escape. And the fate of some 5 million Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians in their homeland has not been an enviable one. Even though they were not deported, they also suffered much privation and hardship during the war, and are still suffering under the unrelenting tyranny of Soviet communism. We have even heard that the native population of the coastal areas of these countries were moved to the interior in order to settle Asiatic peoples there. Outrageous and almost inhuman as this may sound, yet the deliberate policy of the Soviet Union seems to be to colonize these frontiers exposed to the West with peoples who have had no contact with the West.

We in the free world are fully cognizant of these heartbreaking facts. We are well aware of the sad fate that befell to those deportees and of the unbelievable lot of those who are living in the three Baltic countries today. I sympathize wholeheartedly with their lot, and on the 25th anniversary observance of their loss of freedom and independence, I ardently hope for a quick liberation of these peoples from Communist tyranny.

It is high time, Mr. Speaker, that this body should take positive action in the creation of a select committee to go thoroughly into the tragedy of all the captive nations and the formation of sound plans for their liberation from cruel bondage.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Twenty-five years ago this month the Soviet Union seized the Baltic States. During this period of time the Baltic peoples have suffered enormously under the weight of Soviet totalitarianism. They have suffered from every conceivable type of oppression.

Politically, the Baltic peoples are deprived of their right to self-determination. They have no control over their own political destiny. Their political institutions have not been fashioned by themselves, but rather they have been fashioned by their rulers in Moscow.

Economically, the Baltic peoples have no control over the organization of their economic life. Again, their economic institutions are structured according to the Communist norm.

In the religious realm, there is no freedom. The Soviet rulers have carried on the most vicious sort of antireligious campaign.

Similarly in the cultural realm, the Baltic peoples have no control over the determination of content in their literature, music, or theater.

In a word, Mr. Speaker, the Baltic peoples are a colonial peoples.

Their relationship with the leadership in Moscow is no different from that relationship that exists according to the classic definition of colonialism.

Yet, there is a great difference. At least according to the old order of things peoples in a colonial status had hopes that in time they would be liberated. Under the British colonial system the process was by and large carried out in an orderly manner. Peoples, formerly economically backward, were in effect essentially living in a period of preparation for their emergence to modernity. This has been true of the old colonialism, but it is by no means true of the new Communist colonialism. The Baltic peoples are in no state of preparation for emergence into a new form of freedom. They are a people oppressed by the most intolerable form of tyranny, a tyranny that consumes the whole of their national lives.

On this occasion in which we commemorate the 25th anniversary of the Soviet seizure of the Baltic States it is well for us to contemplate the plight of these unfortunate peoples, but it is also well to point to this tragic case as an example of Soviet colonialism and in so doing caution those peoples in the newly emerging states to be wary of the ominous threat of Soviet power and the power of its allies in the Communist world.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 25th anniversary of the Soviet occupation of the three Baltic countries of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. Since 1940, when the Soviet Army poured into their countries, the Baltic people have been trapped behind the Iron Curtain. They were robbed of their independence and transformed into colonies

of the Soviet Union. Since that date, the relatives of these enslaved countries, scattered throughout the free world, have been striving to rectify this injustice and to return freedom, democracy, and independence to these occupied areas.

The brave people of the Baltic States have our admiration and esteem. We know that during the short period they enjoyed independence, their progress in all fields of endeavor and their many splendid achievements earned them respect of democratic peoples everywhere. It is a tragedy that they were again brought under Russian rule.

The U.S.S.R. by its aggressive acts against Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, broke the peace and nonaggression treaties it had signed with those states. The people of these little Baltic States, historically and traditionally Western in orientation and outlook, have continued to place their hopes in the Western World. They have given active expression of their determination to regain freedom. Despite heavy setbacks and trials, they continue to strive for freedom, democracy, and independence. We commend them for their bravery and for maintaining their faith in restoration of their freedom.

Free Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians are conscious of their responsibility toward their captive peoples and feel duty bound to give voice to their will and aspirations to again be free.

Mr. Speaker, we must keep in mind that the captive nations have not lost their desire for freedom and independence. We must not allow the spirit of captive peoples to succumb to despair. With this in mind, I joined other Members of the House early this year in introducing a resolution to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations. I take this occasion—the sad occasion of this anniversary—to call attention to the resolution. Once again I want to urge my colleagues in the House to join efforts to nourish the hopes of enslaved people and to do all we can toward the ultimate goal of a world based on freedom, justice, and peace.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join with many of my fellow colleagues in the House of Representatives to point out the awesome injustice that has been perpetuated on the freedom loving peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Twenty-five years ago in 1940 these Baltic countries were seized by the Soviet Union in flagrant violation of the principles of self-determination. That action by the Soviet Union pointed out the hollowness and hypocrisy of the oft-uttered cries against imperialism by the rulers of that country. That hypocrisy has been consistently demonstrated since that time by the conduct of the Soviet Union in Hungary, Greece, Cuba and in many other countries throughout the world.

The seizure of the Baltic nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia was particularly pernicious and it has not been forgotten by the freedom loving peoples of this world. That action repudiated the work of President Woodrow Wilson

to advance the principle of self-determination in the Treaty of Versailles. Further, that action undermined the total efforts made by the peoples of the United States in World War I to insure self-determination for all peoples.

Today in the twilight of colonialism, we are even more sensitive to the demands of all people for the right to determine their political fortunes. The justice of the claim of self-determination on the part of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia stand clearly before us. To be blind to the necessity of all people, who have won the right to rule themselves, to be forever vigilant.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to make some remarks about an event which took place 25 years ago, and which was the first treacherous act of the Soviet Government early in the last war against the three small, independent Baltic republics. In the middle of 1940 the peaceful and innocent inhabitants of these countries—the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians—were robbed of their independence, their countries were annexed to the Soviet Union, and they were enslaved by the Communist regime imposed upon them by the Kremlin.

The modern history of these sturdy, stouthearted, and industrious peoples is compounded with much misfortune and national tragedy. Their national histories are older than that of czarist Russia, for they had their own independent states long before the rise of the Russian empire. Late in the 18th century, however, all three were absorbed by Russia and so for more than a full century, until the First World War, these peoples lived under the oppressed yoke of Russia's czarist regime. Then, toward the end of that war, as the autocratic regime of the Russian czar was overthrown by the Russian revolution, the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians regained their freedom and proclaimed their independence. They established their own form of democratic governments and institutions, and lived for two decades happily in their historic homelands. Their governments were duly recognized by other sovereign governments, their sovereignty and territorial integrity was guaranteed by treaties signed with the Soviet Government, and all three countries became members of the world community of nations.

During the period of their freedom and independence, which they enjoyed for about two decades, they rebuilt their war-ravaged country, and were quite content with their lot. Unfortunately, however, in the larger world of international politics and diplomacy they were not masters of their own fate; in that sense they were not complete masters of their destiny. With the rise of totalitarian government in Germany and the consolidation of the Soviet Union the Baltic people found themselves in a very precarious position. Nevertheless they succeeded in maintaining their independence until the outbreak of the last World War and then brute force, treacherously used by the Soviet authorities, became the sole arbiter of their destiny. Early in 1940 Soviet forces attached the

three Baltic countries, overran and occupied them, enslaved the peaceful inhabitants there and then all three countries were incorporated into the Soviet Union. Meanwhile Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians by the tens of thousands, mostly helpless and innocent victims of Soviet aggression, were summarily arrested, placed in freight cars and literally carted away to distant and desolate parts of Asiatic Russia. Such was the sad fate of these Baltic peoples in the hands of the Soviet government in 1940.

Subsequent wartime events did not alter the lot of these unfortunate peoples. During 1941–44 Communists were forced out of these countries and the Nazis took their place, but that did not improve conditions in any degree. Toward the end of the war, Soviet forces and their Communist followers once more overran these countries, and they still maintain their firm control there. Under the unrelenting Soviet rule, Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians live in their homeland as prisoners. They do not enjoy any of the freedoms which we in the West consider our birthrights, and their lives are rigidly regimented. Under their callous Communist masters they must work, and work hard in order to keep the body and soul together. They are completely cut off from the free West, and of course they are not allowed to travel in any part of the free world. Though they have our wholehearted sympathy, and our Government has done its utmost to bring about their freedom, we have not been able to do that. On the 25th anniversary observance of their enslavement by the Soviet government, we hope and pray for their deliverance from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, June 15, 1965, marks the 25th anniversary of the brutal Soviet seizure of the Baltic States—Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania—which led to the enslavement of those three gallant nations behind the Iron Curtain.

The Baltic nations, with noble histories going back at least 700 years, had emerged from enslavement by the old Russian empire at the end of World War I. They had begun a new era of freedom, and established their own Western-oriented governments. Despite a lack of natural resources, all three were working industriously to raise their standards of living.

But as the brief interwar period drew to a close, in the fall of 1939, the Soviet Government imposed on her Baltic neighbors the so-called pacts of mutual assistance. By the terms of these pacts, the Soviets assumed, under conditions of duress, certain political and territorial rights in the Baltic region. The significance of these pacts lies in the fact that they constituted the first breach in the wall of Baltic territorial integrity and national independence. For within less than a year, the Red army invaded the Baltic States. By June 16, 1940, the U.S.S.R. had occupied the region and forcibly annexed the three states to the U.S.S.R.

A year later, the Soviets initiated widespread deportation of the government,

business, and religious leaders of these lands to slave labor camps in Siberia. Over 60,000 Estonians, 34,000 Latvians, and 45,000 Lithuanians were either executed or forcibly deported from their homes to distant corners of the U.S.S.R. on the charge that they were "politically unreliable."

Today we commemorate the anniversary of the Soviet conquest of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. On this occasion, we pay our respects, Mr. Speaker, to a truly gallant and heroic people who have in this quarter century suffered enormously from the tyranny of their oppressor.

Let us pray that justice will one day be done in the Baltic region.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian American citizens of Lake County, Ind., in a mass meeting held on Sunday, June 6, 1965, condemned the Soviet Communist tyranny for the aggression and enslavement of their people 25 years ago.

Lithuania was forcibly robbed of its freedom and self-government at that time. Through mass murders, wholesale transportation to slave labor camps and other barbarous methods, the Soviet Union took control of a freedom-loving nation.

The Lithuanian people of the Calumet region of Indiana will continue, along with free Lithuanians everywhere, the fight until self-government and liberty are restored to their homeland.

The following resolution was unanimously adopted at the meeting in East Chicago, Ind., on June 6, 1965:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE AMERICAN LITHUANIAN COMMUNITY BRANCH OF EAST CHICAGO, IND.

Gathered in a mass meeting sponsored by the American Lithuanian community, branch of East Chicago, Ind., on June 6, 1965, at the Lithuanian Parish Hall, in East Chicago, Ind., to recollect the mass deportation of the Lithuanian people and condemn aggression of the Soviet Union which Lithuania has placed at the mercy of ruthless imperialistic power which stops at no means to achieve its end of turning Lithuania into a phantom nation saturated with Russian settlers and spies. The American Lithuanian community unanimously adopted this following resolution:

"Whereas in spite of the compulsory isolation of Lithuania and the overwhelming might of the occupying power, Lithuanians continue to resist fiercely the alien rule. They have not accepted and never will accept Soviet slavery; and

"Whereas the free powers are aware that without a world order of law and justice they would be forced to live a precarious life of threats, brinks, and anxieties; and

"Whereas recent decades have demonstrated again and again that the strangulation of small nations poses a knife of extinction at the throat of the entire free world.

"Resolved, That this meeting respectfully asks the Government of the United States in their future meetings with the Soviet Union, to avoid any agreements about peaceful co-existence and to reaffirm on every suitable occasion the inalienable rights of the Lithuanian people to national independence and individual freedom; be it further

"Resolved, That the United Nations Special Committee of 24, charged with the implementation on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples extend its

concern and investigation to Lithuania, as well as the other Soviet Union subjugated countries on the agenda of the United Nations; be it also

"Resolved, to remove Soviet and military and police forces from occupied Lithuania."

This resolution will be forwarded to the President of the United States, and copies thereof sent to the Secretary of State, the Senators, and Representatives of the State of Indiana, and to the press.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY COMMITTEE,

KAZYS VALEIKA, Chairman.

GARY, IND.

TADAS MECKAUSKAS, Secretary.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, today, we take occasion to remind the free world again of the tragic fate that befell the once proud and free people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia who, in June 1940, were attacked and invaded by the forces of Communist Russia in violation of non-aggression treaties it had signed with those nations. We have heard the story, which must be recounted again and again, of the despotic and ruthless means by which the Soviet Union entrenched its rule and consolidated its power over these Baltic States. The suppression of individual rights and fundamental freedoms, exploitation and mass deportations characterized the Soviet occupation of these nations. For 25 years the people of these countries have endured the tyranny of communism, but their hope for eventual deliverance still remains strong. We know that they continue to resist their oppressors and maintain their faith in man's birthright of freedom.

Let those who say there is no great issue between the free world and the Communist world take heed of the fate of the Baltic States and the means by which they were subordinated to the power-hungry Communist aggressors. The cause of liberty and peace in the world will not be furthered unless we clearly distinguish between the oppressed and the oppressors and stand fast on the principle that the rights of man are inalienable. The free world today must identify itself with those who have become the unwilling subjects of self-imposed rulers and must continue to work for the right of self-determination. Let there be no doubt that our fate as a free people is inextricably involved in this global struggle against Communist aggression and tyranny. Modern conditions have not changed the eternal truths of individual liberty and justice. Our age is marked by a new awareness of the rights of man and his desire for freedom. It is to our peril to deny these truths and to turn our eyes and minds away from the aspirations of man anywhere in the world for freedom and justice.

On this occasion of the 25th anniversary of Soviet aggression against the Baltic States, let us rededicate ourselves to the cause of freedom and reaffirm our faith that in the end liberty and justice will prevail.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, we in the Congress observed the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence—a brief independence. Today we recall the dates of June 15, 1940, and June 14, 1941, days of Soviet aggression on and occupation of Lithuanian soil.

Lithuania, one of the first countries to experience the aggression of both Hitler and the Soviet Union, attempted to maintain a state of absolute neutrality during World War II. However, a mutual assistance treaty between Lithuania and the Soviet Union was imminent when Klaipeda was yielded to Germany. This treaty, signed on October 10, 1939, required Lithuania to admit Soviet garrisons and provide airbases for the Soviets.

After months of discontentment and ill feelings toward the Soviets, Lithuanians were again coerced by the Soviet Union. On June 14, 1940, after deposing the legitimate Lithuanian Government, the Russian Government demanded the immediate formation of a friendly government. To successfully implement and insure this demand, 300,000 Soviet soldiers overran Lithuania. On August 3, 1940, Lithuania, a player on the Soviet stage, speaking from the Soviet script, requested to be a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. As a result of this action, many Lithuanians fled their homeland. Countless others were arrested or deported thus noticeably decreasing the population by 45,000.

To add to the already intolerable situation imposed by the Russians, 30,000 members of the Lithuanian intelligentsia were forcefully deported to Siberia. When Soviet forces retreated from a German attack on June 14, 1941, 5,000 political prisoners were executed.

Russian aggression murdered the peace and the nonaggression treaty. The fact that Russia committed and continued to commit these dastardly acts created horrendous violations of the United Nations Declaration, the Atlantic Charter, the United Nations Charter, the Convention on the Suppression of Crimes of Genocide, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Ironically, all of these documents were signed by the Russian Government.

Today let us join with the free world Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians on the 25th anniversary of Soviet aggression and in concerted voices protest past and present Soviet national and personal atrocities.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago Soviet troops, in violation of the Soviet Union's pledged word, poured into Lithuania, and snuffed out freedom in that progressive country. A puppet government was established, and an independent Lithuania disappeared from the map of Europe. The same fate befell her Baltic brothers, Latvia and Estonia.

But the Soviet Union could not rest content with this. She was determined to break down any will to resistance, and any perpetuation of Lithuanian national traditions. Thus deportations of Lithuanian intellectuals, professionals, and so forth, commenced at once, but they reached their peak a year after the Soviet occupation, when on June 15, 1941, over 30,000 individuals were deported to Siberia.

Shortly thereafter the Germans declared war on their Soviet allies, and they quickly occupied Lithuania. Three years later the Soviets were back, and this time their deportations were to be even more ferocious. Ever since, Lithuania has

been part of the Red empire, and the Russians have been trying to convince the rest of the world that this is the way the Lithuanians want it. But their hypocrisy fools no one.

Lithuania and the Baltic States were the Soviet rehearsal for the occupation and seizure of so much of Eastern Europe in the wake of World War II. Just as we have never acknowledged the justice of those seizures, so we do not recognize any shred of justice to the Soviet domination of Lithuania. We in the West know what true self-determination is. We know that the Soviet Union does not permit it. In calling attention to the anniversaries of Soviet depredations against Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors, we can serve notice once again of America's commitment to freedom, and we can rekindle the flame of hope in the hearts of our many true friends who are caught behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, the years following World War II were a time of world flux and transition. New alliances were formed and the precarious balance of power teetered as wartime conferences desperately attempted to find some solution to the problem of world realignment.

From these conferences arose an awesome phoenix, hovering ominously over genuine attempts at peace and threatening to again plunge the world into another war. Our triumph in 1945 was, in reality, a Pyrrhic victory, for with it came the emergence of the Soviet Union as a world power as deadly as the Fascist-Nazi specter had ever been.

But there was ample precedent for the atrocities the Soviet Union was to commit. The free world, indeed, had been warned that Russia's menacing power could be directed at an independent nation to crush and destroy it. In 1940 the Soviet Union marched ruthlessly on Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and illegally seized control of those nations. Since then she has retained hold of these nations and denied them their individual sovereignty.

In the 25 years since Russia has assumed control, there has been an inexorable erosion of human freedom and independence in the three Baltic States. The peoples of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia are denied a free press, a free assembly and access to free worship—under the fraudulent guise of Soviet "Republicanism." There is no excuse for such a subversion of the word "freedom" to exist any longer.

The people of these nations have always been freedom-loving, dedicated, and persevering. However, the question arises as to how much longer a people can exist in an enslaved land, submitting against their will to a torturing form of totalitarianism. We have nothing but admiration for the people of these nations and for the esprit de coeur and esprit de corps they have shown in the face of nearly insurmountable odds over the past quarter century.

The Baltic States situation must be put into its proper historical perspective. As the nations of Asia and Africa emerge and as they begin to play a larger role in the affairs of the world, we must re-

member what happened 25 years ago in northern Europe.

Although self-determination is seldom as efficient as colonialism, it is a requisite for independent national development. The emerging world must hold free elections, just as free elections should be held in the Baltic Nations. We cannot afford nor allow another set of captive nations to wither in the Eastern Hemisphere.

Then, two things must be done at once. First, Congress must approve the resolution calling for creation of a special Captive Nations Committee. This will serve as the necessary factfinding group to keep the American people and the rest of the free world informed as to what is really happening behind the Iron Curtain. In truth, little is known of what happens from day to day in Estonia or Latvia or Lithuania. Formulation of such a committee would open the eyes of millions of Americans to what really transpires in Soviet-dominated countries.

Secondly, we must make optimum use of the United Nations. We must ask the U.N. to put pressure on Russia to live up to the purposes of the original charter and to let the Baltic States have their freedom. In this way and in this way only will the real purpose of the United Nations be served.

Today we salute the people of the Baltic States for their courage and their fortitude. If no other good has come of their enslavement let it be a warning so that a similar tragedy is not repeated in the future.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, in the history of relations between neighboring nations there are many examples of friendship, cooperation, and peaceful relations. The United States has long unfortified land borders on the north and south, and friendly relations with our neighbors Canada and Mexico. The nations of Western Europe appear to be in a state of peaceful relations with diminishing barriers quite unprecedented in the turbulent history of that area.

But, unfortunately, opposite examples seem to be more numerous, both in the past and in the present. There are scores of examples of aggression, subversion, and treachery which serve as a constant reminder that national liberty and independence cannot be taken for granted.

This month we commemorate the 25th anniversary of one of the most treacherous acts of aggression ever committed. The Soviet Army simply moved in and took possession of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia by force. This put an end to the steady progress that these peoples had been making toward freedom, prosperity, and social advancement.

And the Soviets were not satisfied merely with total control of these small Baltic States. With ruthless inhumanity they proceeded to liquidate and deport thousands of people from their historic homeland. Families were broken up and men and women were put into forced labor camps, often in the distant wastelands of Russia.

But the Soviet efforts to reconstitute the population of these countries inevi-

tably failed to extinguish the powerful national sentiments of the people. Our observance of this tragic anniversary is ample testament to the failures of the Soviet Communists to persuade the world that these nations have ceased to exist.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, all nations and peoples suffered during the last World War, and many small nations suffered more, even though they were not directly involved in it. The three small nations of the Baltic countries were victimized only because of the aggressive and treacherous policy of the Soviet Union.

Early in the war the Soviet Government accused the Governments of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania of anti-Soviet plots. Such charges were made without any perceptible evidence, and proceeding on these charges, the Red army invaded and occupied these three small countries, and then in mid-1940 made them part of the Soviet Union. Thus the sovereign and independent Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian Republics not only ceased to exist, but their helpless citizens were enslaved by Stalin's callous agents. Hundreds of thousands of innocent and helpless people were arrested and deported to distant parts of the Soviet Empire, while those left behind were regimented and forced to work for their Communist overlords. This is what these once proud and gallant souls have been doing in their homelands during the last 25 years.

On the observance of the 25th anniversary of the Soviet Government's illegal seizure of these countries, let us hope that soon these peoples will regain their freedom.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, the seizure and outright annexation of Lithuania by Soviet Russia constitutes one of the most flagrant violations of long-established and well-recognized international law. And the subsequent enslavement of the Lithuanian peoples was an outrageously inhuman act.

Lithuanians had regained their freedom and independence at the end of the First World War. Thenceforth they were fully occupied with the task of rebuilding and recreating their homeland in their own image. And in this they had done remarkably well. In the course of two decades they had made their small country a haven for themselves, and their only desire and goal was to be allowed to work out their salvation in peace. But peace was denied to them by their inveterate enemy, the Soviet Government. In violation of its solemnly signed treaty, the Soviet Government broke the back of the Lithuanian Government by force, until that Government had to submit to the Soviet dictate. Early in 1940 the country was invaded by the Red army, occupied, and then made part of the Soviet Union. Thus the young and strong Lithuanian Republic was robbed of its existence, and its helpless people enslaved by the agents of the Soviet Government. Today, on the 25th anniversary of Lithuania's illegal seizure by the Soviet Union, we all hope and pray for its liberation.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Lithuanians, Lat-

vians, and Estonians throughout the world who have kept the spark of freedom alive for a quarter of a century.

Millions of helpless and innocent people died during World War II, and many millions more suffered indescribable misery and hardship. In Europe, the war's most innocent victims were the peoples of the three small, peaceful, independent republics in northeastern Europe—the Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians. The tragedy of these peoples was brought on by the deliberate and evil designs of the men in the Kremlin.

These peoples had endured czarist Russia's autocratic yoke for more than a century, and had regained their independence at the end of the First World War. In their historic homelands they had instituted their own democratic governments, with all variety of institutions under freedom. But as the international situation in Europe became tense late in the 1930's, and clouds of war began to darken the skies in 1939, these peoples realized their precarious status and were apprehensive of their own fate. The government officials in all three of these countries were fully aware of the dangers threatening them, but they were helpless to avert the impending tragedy.

Soon after the outbreak of the war, the leaders of these governments were ruthlessly bullied by the Soviet Government. They were forced to sign mutual defense and assistance pacts with the Soviet Union. Then early in 1940, under some flagrant pretext, the governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia were accused by the Kremlin of anti-Soviet activities. Soon the Red army moved into these countries, and many of the government officials of these countries fled for the safety of their lives. In June Soviet occupation of these countries was complete, and a few weeks later all three were incorporated into the Soviet Union.

Thus was brought about the seizure of the three Baltic countries by the Soviet Union and the enslavement of some 5 million peoples in these countries. Of these innocent peoples, several hundred thousands were summarily arrested and deported to distant parts of the Soviet Union, most of whom have probably died in prison-labor camps. I am happy to say that the Government of the United States and the people of this country have never recognized the seizure of these countries by the Soviet Union as valid. We still recognize the old, legally elected governments of these countries and continue to extend them diplomatic recognition. And, of course, we all hope, as do freedom-loving Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians all over the world, that some day, and soon, these countries will be able to resume their rightful places in the family of independent nations.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 25th anniversary of Soviet Russia's captivity of the Baltic States. It was on June 15, 1940, that the Red army moved into Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and took over these free and independent nations by force of arms.

During these 25 years, the three countries have lost more than one-fourth of their populations. Hundreds of

thousands were murdered by the Soviet despots or died in exile in Russian slave-labor camps.

But Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians are proud and courageous peoples. They will never give up in their prayers and hopes for the day of liberation from tyranny nor in their search for help from the governments of other freedom-loving peoples.

Mr. Speaker, with the help and leadership of the United States and the United Nations, many new free and independent nations have been established in Asia and Africa since World War II. But what of formerly free and independent nations that no longer enjoy that status but are now bearing the yoke of oppression imposed by the Kremlin?

In the name of consistency, the United Nations can and should do no less than champion the cause of freedom for these peoples as well. It was with that goal that I introduced earlier this year House Concurrent Resolution 295, which declares it to be the sense of Congress that the President should instruct the U.S. mission to the United Nations to bring up the Baltic States question in that body.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include House Concurrent Resolution 295 at this point:

H. CON. RES. 295

Whereas the United States has consistently recognized and upheld the right of the Baltic States to national independence and to the enjoyment of all independent rights and freedoms; and

Whereas the Charter of the United Nations declares as one of its purposes the development of friendly relations among nations based "on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples"; and

Whereas the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics has by force suppressed the freedom of the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and continues to deny them the right of self-determination by free elections; and

Whereas involuntary enslavement cannot be encouraged or sanctioned by the United States and other nations subscribing to principles of freedom: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President should instruct the United States mission to the United Nations to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations and ask the United Nations request the Soviets—

(1) to withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and

(2) to return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons, and slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union.

SEC. 2. It is further the sense of the Congress that the President should instruct the United States mission to the United Nations to request the United Nations to conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, the three Baltic countries, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, constitute a natural unit by themselves, and they have been united by their common interest in peace and by their desire to maintain their independence. But being relatively small and weak, they have not always been successful in warding off dangers which have threatened their independence.

Late in the 18th century they could not withstand the czarist Russia's aggressive expansion, and all three were conquered and made part of the Russian Empire. For more than a century these stout and sturdy fighters had to submit to the cruel and callous agents of the czars, for they were in no position to challenge Russia's colossal armed forces. Toward the end of the First World War, however, they had their golden opportunity. Russia's oppressive regime was shattered. The peoples in the Baltic countries felt free and proclaimed their independence.

Thenceforth, for two decades these energetic and industrious peoples remade their war-ravaged countries, strengthened their democratic institutions, became members of the sovereign community of nations and were quite content with their lot in their respective countries. All this was to their liking while there was peace in Europe. But the outbreak of the last war changed everything, bringing on disaster and tragedy to them.

Early in the war the Soviet Government wanted to put an end to the independent status of these countries and annex them to the Soviet Union. While the friends of the Baltic peoples in the West were in the throes of war, Soviet leaders forced the Governments of the Baltic countries to submit to humiliating terms. Mutual assistance pacts were signed, strategic parts of these countries were occupied by Soviet forces, then the Red army overran and occupied all three countries, and finally, in mid-1940 they were made part of the Soviet Union.

By treacherous acts and illegal means the Soviet Government thus robbed the Baltic peoples of their freedom and put an end to their independent existence. To this day this illegal seizure of the Baltic countries by the Soviet Government constitutes a cruel international crime committed against the innocent and inoffensive Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians. On the 25th anniversary observance of this international robbery we once more condemn it, and pray for the deliverance or these peoples from Soviet totalitarian tyranny.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with my colleagues here this afternoon in recognition and remembrance of the heroic people of Lithuania and the other Baltic States on this occasion of the 25th anniversary of Soviet aggression against them.

Twenty-five years ago, on June 15, 1940, the Russian troops overran Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, took away their independence and transformed them into colonies of the Soviet Union.

It was, indeed, a black and treacherous day in the history of mankind. The peaceful people of the progressive Baltic States were practically forced into slavery by the Russian dictators and from that dark day until this very moment they have been truly isolated from the rest of the free world.

Although the people of the Baltic States have been subjected to these terrible persecutions through the years we have no cause to despair that they will never regain their liberty. In fact we

have great cause to think just the opposite. For the history of these states reveals that even in their worst times of trials and tragedies they demonstrated again and again that they have retained their faith and trust that divine providence would always return their bright promise and destiny to them.

From our own knowledge of their history and personal observation of the Lithuanian-Americans and the other peoples of the Baltic States we know they have an unabiding faith that the Communists can never destroy.

We know they have a high courage that the Communists can never vanquish.

We know that they have a Christian character and culture that will survive when all the fraud and the hypocrisy of atheistic tyrants have vanished from the face of the earth.

It is to this objective that we and all the other friends of the Lithuanian and Baltic peoples must continue to dedicate our efforts.

To this end I, early last January, introduced House Concurrent Resolution 75 which calls upon the Congress to request the President to bring up the Baltic States question in the United Nations and to ask the United Nations to urge the Soviet Union to withdraw from Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, return the Baltic exiles to their homes and provide for free elections under the supervision of the United Nations. This resolution is designed to reaffirm a basic principle of U.S. policy—self-determination of all peoples and the right of all peoples to choose their own form of government. I most earnestly hope the Congress will see fit to approve this or a similar resolution in the near future.

It is most fitting that we pause here this afternoon to recall to the world the tragic history of the Baltic people. It is further fitting that we also solemnly pledge that both as Members of Congress and private citizens we will never cease our united efforts until the gallant people of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia and all other subjugated peoples have been restored to freedom in a world at peace.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the brave but unfortunate peoples of the Baltic countries—Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians—have had long and difficult histories. They have had their ups and downs, but fate was most cruel to them in 1940. In the middle of that year these northeastern democracies were overrun by the Red army, their inhabitants enslaved and then all three countries annexed to the Soviet Union. Thus these strong and brave people, who had withstood the oppressive and callous regimes of the czars for more than a century, and had regained their national freedom at the end of the First World War, had to submit to the treachery of Stalin's Communist agents.

Mid-1940 marked the end of freedom in these Baltic lands, and since then these unhappy souls have been suffering under Soviet totalitarian tyranny. Besides enslaving some 5 million Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians in these countries, at the time hundreds of thousands innocent people were arrested, impris-

oned and then deported to inhospitable regions of Asiatic Russia. During the war there was some hope for their return after the war, but not many of these people survived the hardship and misery that was their lot in their prison labor camps.

Today, in observing the 25th anniversary of their tragedy, we ardently pray for the deliverance of these Baltic peoples from Communist totalitarianism.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago the freedom loving peoples of the Baltic States were thrust under the yoke of Communist oppression. These sovereign nations were subjected by brute force, both physical and psychological. At the time of this flagrant aggression these states were sovereign and independent deserving of all the rights that any other state in the world community of nations possessed. This was in 1940. Now the year is 1965 and the Baltic States are no longer sovereign.

The memory of this oppression, which has perhaps never been equaled in history for brutality and utter disregard for human rights, has slipped into the dim past. We have for the most part forgotten. Since June 1940 the Baltic States—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—have suffered to lose almost one-fourth of their populations. The Soviets have employed subversion, slave labor camps and even liquidation in their ruthless capture of these peoples.

The events which took place in the Baltic States during these tragic months of 1940 were repeated throughout Eastern Europe and the Far East in the period after World War II. None of us needs to be reminded of the manner in which communism was imposed upon Poland and the other states of East Europe. All forces of dissent were silenced by terror and death. Communist authority was thrust upon a large sector of the European population that had hoped for a new era of democracy and freedom. Instead, their reward for surviving the Nazi conquest was another more enduring and oppressive type of tyranny, communism.

We must cast aside the illusion that East Europe and the Baltic States are solidly Communist. The increasing demonstrations in recent years attest to the fact that the people of these supposedly sovereign nations yearn for real freedom and true independence. We cannot with any rationality cross off the 30,000 persons who died after World War II attempting to stem the tide of communism in the Baltic States. We can gain perspective by remembering that only 4,000 died for American independence during the Revolutionary War.

Now a new revolution is upon the world, the revolution of rising expectations. Nations throughout the world are gaining independence and freedom. In Africa and Asia the United States is backing attempts of colonies to gain independence. The United States has fought long and hard to help the causes of these nations, and rightly so. But our task is far from completed. World opinion is now against the concept of colonialism. Now is the time for the United States to sponsor in the United Nations the cause of freedom and inde-

pendence for the Baltic States and indeed all of the Eastern European nations that now suffocate under the yoke of Soviet oppression.

Without our help I can scarcely imagine these nations gaining their independence. In 1775 it took a shot that was heard around the world to free our Nation. The annals of the Revolution ring with the names of volunteers from East Europe. Now in 1965 we are strong. Let us now speak the words that will be heard around the world and demand the freedom that the peoples of the Baltic States so richly deserve.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, for the last 25 years the Baltic States—the brave states of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—have suffered under the occupation of the Soviet Union. Their people have been murdered, deported, terrorized by the Russian Communists. Although they have fought and withstood these onslaughts against their peoples and nations with courage and strength, they are still under Soviet enslavement. They want and deserve their freedom and independence. In an attempt to assist them to receive these rights, I, along with many other Members of Congress, have introduced the following resolution which I sincerely hope will receive prompt and favorable action in the Congress:

H. CON. RES. 40

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere; and

Whereas so many countries under colonial domination have been or are being given the opportunity to establish their own independent states, on the other hand, the Baltic nations having a great historical past and having enjoyed the blessings of freedom for centuries are now subjugated to the most brutal colonial oppression; and

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by legal or democratic processes; and

Whereas the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by force of arms; and

Whereas Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians desire, fight and die for their national independence; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America maintains diplomatic relations with the free Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and consistently has refused to recognize their seizure and forced "incorporation" into the Soviet Union; and

Whereas no real peace and security can be achieved in the world while Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia remain enslaved by the Soviet Union: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should take such steps as he may deem appropriate to bring before the United Nations the question of Soviet action in the Baltic States for the purpose of urging the United Nations to request that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—

(1) withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and

(2) return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons, and slave labor camps in the Soviet Union.

SEC. 2. The United Nations should conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision and punish Soviet Communists who are guilty of crimes against the peoples of the Baltic States.

H.R. 8629 WILL INJURE ILLINOIS INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a provision in H.R. 8629 which, I feel, would injure Illinois industry and Illinois farmers by subsidizing wheat for industrial uses at the expense of corn.

I understand the bill has been reported to the House Agriculture Committee by the Wheat Subcommittee. The proposed subsidy in H.R. 8629 would injure the entire corn industry, as well as the grain sorghum industry, since both corn and grain sorghums are used to produce starch which goes into glue and adhesives for industrial purposes.

At present, the processors of wheat which is made into flour must purchase a certificate for each bushel of wheat processed. H.R. 8629 would exempt flour clears, a flour product, when not used for human consumption, from the certificate payment. This would mean that flour clears used for industrial consumption would be processed from wheat which, at present market prices, is not too far from the price of corn. The flour clears would be exempt from the 75 cents a bushel certificate payment under present law and around \$1.25 a bushel in the proposed bill. Thus, wheat would be directly competitive with corn, and also grain sorghums, in the industrial starch market.

The estimated immediate effect under the proposed bill is approximately a \$3 million exemption under the program. The long-range potential effect is \$50 million and a replacement of corn by wheat of some 40 million bushels. Who is going to pay for this? First the corn producer will lose markets by legislative action; and secondly, the wheat farmer will have received less than his cost of production or the taxpayer will bear the burden.

Price relationships between agricultural products are very complicated. But to understand this situation we have only to look at the historical price relationship between corn and wheat. The latter product has been consistently higher in price. It was higher before the Federal farm programs and the programs recognized the disparity by higher supports for wheat and, when wheat supports were lowered, by higher payments to the wheat farmers than to corn farmers. In other words, the Congress and the Executive branch of the Government have sought, through the programs, to see to it that the return to the wheat farmer per bushel is substantially higher per bushel than the return to the corn farmer.

Furthermore, the price differential which has prevailed between wheat and

corn is recognized in the parity figures for both commodities. As House Members know, parity is supposed to represent the fair market value of an agricultural product. Today, the parity price of corn is about \$1.58 a bushel, the parity price of wheat around \$2.57 a bushel, or a difference of almost \$1 per bushel.

The primary reason for the difference in price between corn and wheat is the former's much higher yield per acre, and, in consequence, lower production costs for corn. Wheat costs of production are around 70 cents a bushel higher than for corn. The national average cost of production is roughly 85 cents per bushel for corn and \$1.55 for wheat.

The argument most frequently put forward in support of the subsidy for wheat is that it simply would enable both the domestic processors of corn and wheat to buy at the world market price. But the world price has no relationship to the corn and wheat bought here to be turned into starch for industrial purposes. Both domestic processors pay domestic prices. We establish the world price of corn here because of our tremendous output; wheat processors do not have access to foreign wheat because of an import quota which limits imports to only a few thousand bushels annually. Insofar as I can see the world price contention is completely irrelevant.

Mr. Speaker, let us, in an effort to simplify this matter, assume that no Federal program existed. Both wheat and corn would be sold in a free market and, inevitably, wheat would go to the buyer at a price substantially higher than that for corn. When he sold the wheat, the farmer would not reduce the price because a part of it, when milled into flour, would be flour clears, some of which might not be used for human consumption. He would balk at giving processors, who wanted to turn wheat starch into glue and adhesives, a subsidy. Similarly, the Government should balk at a subsidy and that is what, after this question is analyzed, is proposed in H.R. 8629—the subsidization of wheat to replace corn and grain sorghums.

More than 300 million bushels of corn are bought annually by the wet and dry corn milling industries, which make most of the starch used in industry. Comparatively little wheat is made into industrial starch, because the price is and has been higher than the price of corn. The corn milling industries have built their plants and developed their markets on the price relationship which H.R. 8629 now proposes to upset. The grain sorghum processors who make industrial starch also have built their business on the historic price relationships. Now, we propose to subsidize one agricultural product at the expense of others. If we exempt flour clears not used for human consumption in H.R. 8629 and keep that exemption, we can expect, over the years, to find the industrial starch market dominated by wheat. For, if this subsidy does not enable wheat to take the market, the Congress—if it follows the line of reasoning embodied in H.R. 8629—will increase the subsidy until the objective is accomplished.

I think the entire Illinois delegation should vigorously oppose the subsidy proposed in H.R. 8629. Illinois is the leading commercial corn State and, in 1963, Illinois commercial corn sales approximated one-third of the total commercial corn sales. While my State probably has more corn processing plants than any other State, the industry is very important in other States and the processing of grain sorghums into starch for industry is becoming increasingly important.

The subsidy for wheat would be established by amending section 379d(d) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. At present section 379d(d) is as follows:

As used in this subtitle, the term "food product" means flour, semolina, farina, bulgur, beverage and any other product composed wholly or partly of wheat which the Secretary may determine to be a food product.

The amendment, as charged by H.R. 8629 reads:

As used in this subtitle, the term "food product" means flour, excluding flour clears not used for human consumption as determined by the Secretary, semolina, farina, bulgur, beverage and any other product composed wholly or partly of wheat which the Secretary may determine to be a food product.

I see no reason for the disruption and unemployment in Illinois and other States which would follow the subsidy proposal in H.R. 8629. It would not increase the consumption of agricultural products at all, since we merely would be substituting one agricultural product for other agricultural products.

To repeat, the central issue is whether the Government will subsidize wheat to replace corn and grain sorghums in industrial products. Mr. Speaker, I think the answer should be a loud and resounding "No."

MORALITY IN PUBLIC SERVICE

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS] may extend his remarks in the body of the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, too often we in this country accept as uncontested fact that our system of government will automatically prevail over everything and will not be seriously challenged, at least from within.

It is well that we be reminded that self-government has failed on other occasions, and might still be considered as experimental from the standpoint of history.

In this connection I call attention to the following portion of an article by Mr. N. S. Meese appearing in the New Age magazine for June 1965:

Benjamin Franklin's long life, wide experience, and extensive study had convinced him that republics had a history of enjoying only short lives. It was doubtless this

that prompted him to answer an inquiry following the Philadelphia Convention as to what kind of government was in store for the country by saying, "We have given you a republic—if you can keep it." He knew only too well that under the new Constitution the people gave to those they elected to govern them dangerous power, and he, with Washington and others, had misgivings.

Now, two centuries later, those who have the most to lose seem to have become the least vigilant in guarding the fundamental freedoms for which over the years thousands have died ingloriously to gain. They are threatened now to an even greater degree than when Senator Borah warned of the danger to them by attrition. They can never be kept safe by being inscribed on a sheet of parchment preserved in our archives. They can be preserved only when they are held deep in the hearts of men and women who are aware of their cost in blood and treasure and who know what their loss would mean.

The Great Charter of our liberties as signed in the summer of 1787 and amended subsequently in accordance with the provisions contained in it is a valid contract between the people of this Nation and their Government. Being such it is the duty of both parties to that contract to see that it is fully and faithfully observed in both letter and spirit rather than interpreted in a manner dictated by the whims of men.

The greatest need in this country today is for a resurgence of morality in public service—a new and honest respect for the spirit and meaning of the Constitution of the United States and a firm resolve by those who have sworn to protect and defend it to abide by that oath. They would do well to remember Gen. Robert E. Lee's observation that "Duty is the sublimest word in our language. You cannot do more; you should never wish to do less."—N. S. Meese.

CIA OPERATIONS REMAIN SECRET

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the following article, from the Washington Post of June 3, to the House for consideration. The article was written by Mr. Harry Ferguson and concerns the Central Intelligence Agency.

It is often distressing to me to hear severe criticism of the CIA by citizens—including Members of Congress—who have only limited knowledge of its functions and activities. How many times have we heard indignant protests about the CIA being an all too powerful, fourth branch of the U.S. Government? A recent publication, "The Invisible Government," pictures the CIA as some sort of power-hungry, aggressive, and irresponsible organization. For some strange reason, the CIA's most vocal critics seem to attack the nature of its secrecy. I wonder if these critics can imagine how effective an intelligence apparatus could be were it required to respond to ever ounce of criticism and skepticism. I daresay were that the case, we might as well close up shop.

Mr. Speaker, I am not among those Members privy to appraisal of the CIA's

scope. I do know, however—as we all should know—that a congressional committee does exist to insure that the CIA does not exceed its bounds. I can appreciate, therefore, that there are those among us who are privy to such information and who have a great knowledge of the activities of this organization; and I might add that I have not heard protest from any of these Members about the CIA being irresponsible or power hungry or anything.

Mr. Speaker, from what I know of the CIA, I can honestly say that I heartily approve; and of what I do not know, I can hastily add that it is quite obviously none of my business. I am grateful and proud that we have men and women in our country who are willing to make sacrifices to provide us with information we desperately need for our own defense and the defense of all freemen. I am likewise grateful that the CIA stands above its critics and therefore protects the very secrets it needs to survive and to render effective service to our country.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 3, 1965]

CIA'S OPERATIONS REMAIN A SECRET TO ALL BUT A FEW

(By Harry Ferguson)

A story is going around that one day a top official of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) needed some information on the manager of a factory in the Soviet Union. He called for the files and, somewhat to his surprise, found all possible information about the man, including the fact that his mistress had dyed her hair three times. Different color every time.

It could be true, for the CIA has information about Russia that would shock Moscow. Each month the CIA buys or otherwise obtains 200,000 pieces of literature from Russia, the European Communist bloc, and Red China. It has a translating computer that turns Russian into English at the rate of 30,000 words an hour. Nothing from Russia is too small to interest the CIA—railroad timetables, the pig population in the Ukraine, what movie is being shown in Kiev.

The CIA operates in a highly unorthodox fashion. It lists its number in the telephone book and everybody knows that its headquarters are at Langley, Va. But the CIA has plenty of secrets and keeps them well.

BUDGET KEPT SECRET

There are perhaps a dozen men in Washington who know how much the CIA spends annually, but the best guesses are between \$400 million and \$1 billion. Nowhere in the Federal budget will you find any money allotted to the CIA.

Each year the CIA Director appears before small panels made up of senior members of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees. He tells them how much money he needs, but doesn't have to explain how he is going to spend it. After the Congressmen OK the expenditure, the money is broken up into small items and salted and hidden throughout the Federal budget. An item for 1,000 monkey wrenches in the Air Force budget could well be CIA money.

People who work for the CIA are divided into "overts" and "illegals." The overts work in open, keep regular office hours and the only restraint they are under is that they are forbidden to discuss the type of work they do. The illegals fan out across the world and operate in the full knowledge that if they are caught, they may forfeit their lives. One of the big battlegrounds of espionage is Berlin, and the West German

Government estimates there are 12,000 Soviet intelligence agents there. Nobody has any precise figures on the CIA strength in Berlin, but it can be assumed the situation is well covered.

BECOMES A NEW MAN

The first thing that happens to a man when he becomes a CIA illegal is that he loses his identity. He gets a new name, a new birthplace, and a new family. If he is going to operate in Italy, he not only must learn to speak flawless Italian, but in the precise accent of the province where he will be working.

Then he is papered. He is equipped with every sort of document he could conceivably need in his new environment and he is taught how to manufacture new ones if the need arises.

The next thing is to arrange a drop, a place where the agent can leave information and be sure it will wind up in Langley, Va.

The CIA's enemies see it as a sort of anonymous branch of the U.S. Government that is going around meddling in the internal affairs of both friendly and unfriendly nations. It is accused of helping make a complete botch of the Bay of Pigs invasion in Cuba and the events leading up to the present crisis in South Vietnam. Some persons even profess to see a threat to our own Government from an organization maintaining a sort of private army and operating in secrecy.

Allen Dulles, former CIA Director, denied all this in a recent television interview. He said the CIA never had jumped into a situation without getting the consent of the President. He also defended the necessity for secrecy by pointing out that Russia and Red China were pushing their espionage battles strongly and that you had to fight fire with fire.

PROJECT HEAD START

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor of Friday, May 21, published an article on Project Head Start which vividly and expertly explained the need and value of this program. The article spells out clearly the crux of the problem, which it terms "the tragic circle of poverty-ignorance in which so many Americans are caught."

Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress and every American interested in this pressing problem should read this article. For this reason, I include it in full as part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A HEAD START

Few scenes are filled with greater promise or disappointment than that of the young child hunched over his school desk. If all goes right, the child is on his way to the mastery of knowledge which will help make his life happy and meaningful. But if things go wrong, sorrow, tragedy, and waste are too often the result.

The United States is about to invest \$112 million to see if some 530,000 young children from poverty-stricken or cultureless homes can be helped make the important first step in education. This is "Project Head Start," whereby these children will gather in

thousands of preschool centers for a 6 to 8 weeks' practical training program. In general, only those children who will enter kindergarten this fall will attend.

The purpose of the program is short, sharp, and crucial. It is to provide these children with the outlook, training, and encouragement which will give them a better chance to benefit from the precious years of education which lie ahead. For experience has shown that all too often the children from these homes are unequipped to cope with the stern demands of education, fall behind, and eventually fall out.

The ability to speak coherently, the use of sanitary facilities, the knowledge of how to get on with their fellows, these and many more such fundamentals are often lacking among such pitifully deprived children. When these are learned, the child's ability to profit from education is immeasurably heightened.

As of the moment, this is a "one-shot" affair. Washington apparently wishes to weigh the results of this summer's effort to see whether the project should be continued, altered, or dropped. Many questions remain unanswered. Will 6 to 8 weeks' training be enough? Where will the special-knowledge teachers come from? How much larger should the effort be to have a sure hope of ending the tragic circle of poverty-ignorance in which so many Americans are caught?

But we rejoice to see this start. We wish it well wholeheartedly. We agree with President Johnson that we must keep in mind that the "5- and 6-year-old children are the inheritors of poverty's curse and not its creators." He is right in declaring that unless we act, these children will pass these burdens on to future generations.

Although Washington has taken the first step in this program, if there is anything that the Federal Government cannot do alone, it is to lift this burden of cultural deprivation from millions of children. Only united community efforts in cities, towns, and villages all over the land can get to the real roots of the problem. This requires determination, organization, and inspiration. Yet we can think of few efforts which can do more to guarantee a happier tomorrow than this.

REFORM OF FEDERAL RESERVE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is very heartening to a Member who represents thousands of workingmen to read that the administration has taken a firm stand against the alarmist remarks last week by the Chairman of the independent Federal Reserve Board. The Fed, of course, controls the cost and availability of credit for all Americans, and its tight money policies have caused more recessions than I like to recall.

Mr. Martin, as you know, just last week suggested that we were on the verge of 1929 all over again. Naturally, his remedy would be to yank hard on the credit reins.

But on June 8, before a congressional committee, Secretary of the Treasury Fowler, speaking for the Johnson administration, reassured a nervous business community that he was not at all fearful

of another 1929 crash and stressed that the American economy is expanding in a healthy, balanced way.

Mr. Speaker, I feel strongly that this incident underscores the urgent need for thorough reform of the Federal Reserve System.

JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION SEEKS SAFEGUARDS AGAINST CONFLICT OF INTERESTS OR FAVORITISM

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, there have been few administrations in the history of this country that have not found it necessary to cope with problems of waste and scandal in their respective administrations.

Mr. Speaker, every President has been aware of the necessity of excluding such matters from his administration but I think no one more than the present incumbent of that high office, President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, there was an article on this subject in the Corpus Christi Caller-Times, the daily newspaper of my hometown in Texas, on May 12, 1965, which I include at this point in the Record:

JOHNSON SEEKS SAFEGUARDS AGAINST FEDERAL SCANDALS

President Johnson has been in public life long enough to know that there is no absolute protection against wrongdoing in the executive department. But he is determined to go as far as he can to protect himself and the Government against scandal.

He has issued an Executive order, going considerably further than those of his predecessors, requiring within 90 days a full statement of financial interests by 200 officials who are subordinate only to him. An additional 2,000 others in important policymaking offices will be required to make financial statements to their agency or department heads.

"We cannot tolerate conflicts of interest or favoritism—or even conduct which gives the appearance that such actions are occurring—and it is our intention to see that this does not take place in the Federal Government," the President said in issuing his Executive order.

The President went to the heart of the matter when he said that officials must avoid even the appearance of evil. It is a principle that businessmen entering Government may find harsh. But the evil as well as the appearance of evil must be avoided by those who accept the privilege of serving in Government.

LAGGING MONETARY GROWTH FORCES BANKS INTO QUESTIONABLE PRACTICES—FED SHRINKS MONEY SUPPLY BY \$1.2 BILLION IN MAY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve's failure to permit growth in the money supply adequate to accommodate the legitimate needs of business and commerce has forced many banks to resort to unusual and questionable practices in order to relieve their tight reserve positions. In fact, the Federal Reserve actually reduced the money supply by \$1.2 billion in May alone. Not only are member banks indebted to their Federal Reserve banks to the tune of approximately \$150 million, but a number of them have found it necessary to aggressively seek time and savings deposits so that they can make new loans. While I certainly admire their initiative, I am deeply disturbed by official reports that several recent cases of bank newspaper advertising have involved a misrepresentation of facts, possibly in violation of the Federal securities laws. These cases arose with respect to the promotion of certificates of deposits to appeal to the general public.

Furthermore, Chase Manhattan and First National City Bank in New York just last week sold over a half billion dollars in debentures to raise quick cash needed to serve their customers. It is not entirely clear that the issuance of debentures or capital notes by national banks is provided for by law. What effects these sales will have on the reserves of other banks is uncertain, but unless the Fed loosens up on the credit reins, other banks may wake up and find that hundreds of millions of their own reserves have disappeared—stolen, if you please. While there is a growing scarcity of money that only the Fed can cure, I am very hopeful that our monetary managers will reverse their stubborn determination to hold down a healthy growth in the money supply. By their so doing not only would our commercial banks be relieved of pressures to pursue extreme measures to improve their lending capabilities, but also the prospects will be much better for continuation of the orderly expansion of business and economic activity we have all enjoyed during the past several years.

FLAG DAY

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, today is Flag Day and throughout America the Elks and many other patriotic and civic groups hold parades and ceremonies to observe this day in honor of Old Glory.

I think it would be well for the Members of Congress to dedicate ourselves according to the highest ideals of those Americans who gave their lives to save the flag for us. As for myself, as I think of the bills that the Congress will have to consider in the next 2 months, I promise that I will always think of our

Government first and decide all questions in the best interest of our country—not to be provincial or selfish.

It would be well for all Members of the Congress to bear that in mind because our flag and our country are still the best.

SELWAY-BITTERROOT AREA

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, because of the controversy that has developed over the classification of the Selway-Bitterroot area as a wilderness area, I am submitting for the RECORD a very edifying article by Ferris Weddle of the Lewiston Morning Tribune. I heartily recommend the reading of this article to any of my colleagues who are interested in the Selway-Bitterroot area or the preservation and conservation of wilderness areas.

[From the Lewiston Morning Tribune,
May 23, 1965]

STORM CLOUDS SWIRL OVER UPPER SELWAY (By Ferris Weddle)

The Upper Selway has become the new battleground in the old conflict over wilderness versus multiple-use.

Thousands of plain and prominent citizens have become involved in the controversy. Dozens of regional and national conservation organizations have entered the picture—including the Wilderness Society, the Sierra Club, the National Wildlife Federation, and the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs. The Upper Selway is not merely an Idaho-Montana problem, but a national problem which touches upon a major public resource—wilderness.

This case also has become a test, in the view of some wilderness supporters, of the integrity of the U.S. Forest Service in the management of wilderness areas.

Geographically, the Upper Selway (including Upper Bargamin Creek) is 260,000 acres of semiprimitive country in the Bitterroot National Forest lying between the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Area and the Salmon River Breaks Primitive Area. It is also known as the Magruder Corridor and as Area E on Forest Service maps.

From 1936 until January 11, 1963, the Upper Selway was a protected part of the Selway-Bitterroot Primitive Area. On January 11, using the authority of a Department of Agriculture regulation, Secretary Orville L. Freeman reclassified the primitive area as a wilderness area.

In the reclassification, over 400,000 acres, including the Upper Selway, were deleted from the original primitive area. The final boundary changes had not been made public by the Secretary or the Forest Service. Although many of the recommendations of the conservation groups given in public meetings in 1961 had been heeded, the inclusion of the Upper Selway had not.

Wilderness supporters felt that they had been betrayed and that Secretary Freeman had acted hastily to forestall further discussions of the Upper Selway and other changes in the Selway-Bitterroot boundaries. Thus the stage was set for the controversy.

Why had the Upper Selway been declassified? Neal M. Rahm, regional forester for the northern region at Missoula, explains

it this way: "The presence of a road system in area E strongly influenced the Secretary's final decision. Wilderness standards do not permit such road development."

The road system Rahm refers to is the Magruder Road, extending from Darby, Mont., to Elk City, Idaho, bisecting the disputed area. The road and three short spur roads were built in the 1930's by the CCC for fire protection and administrative purposes. They are slow-speed, poor quality roads, suitable for wilderness travel only. They have provided access to parts of the larger wilderness area.

Wilderness supporters have not accepted the presence of this road system as sufficient reason to leave the Magruder Corridor unprotected. They had earlier proposed another solution: Use the Magruder Road as a boundary between the wilderness area on the north and the newly created Salmon River Breaks Primitive Area on the south. Exclusions from wilderness status could be set up on each side of the spur roads. Primitive camp and picnic spots could be built along the Magruder Road without impairing the wilderness values of the Upper Selway.

It became apparent to conservationists that the Forest Service had many plans for the Upper Selway, and that the road system was only one reason for the exclusion of the area.

"Other information available indicated that area E was more logically suited for general multiple use," according to Rahm. "The multiple-use plan will provide for the protection of the streams and it will also include road betterment and, of course, some road construction. Timber harvesting is planned on only part of the area. The Forest Service believes that recreation has a very important value in the Upper Selway and the management program fully recognizes this."

Road improvement has already begun on the Montana side of the Upper Selway. A contract for a 6½-mile stretch, to the Nez Perce Pass, has been let with \$350,000 estimated as the cost.

Planned for improvement is the section from the pass to the Magruder ranger station, and eventually to Elk City. This road will also serve as the main route for logging operations. Other roads will be required to reach the timber harvest areas.

A JEWEL OF A RIVER

Because the Upper Selway holds the headwaters of the Selway River, the region represents to many people the heartbeat of the wilderness area. Of all the rivers now under consideration for a national wild rivers system, the Selway is the jewel—one of the few true wilderness streams remaining in the United States outside of Alaska. It is increasingly used by white-water enthusiasts, by fishermen and wilderness campers.

At the moment, only about 45 miles of the Selway is protected. The Forest Service has said the Selway and other streams will be protected. How will this be done? According to Harold E. Andersen, supervisor of the Bitterroot National Forest, a riverbreak zone, averaging a mile in width, will be set up on each side of the river and along important feeder streams.

This looks good on paper, but will it keep the Selway safe from the effects of erosion? Conservationists do not think so.

Stock grazing and mining are not factors in the multiple-use plans, according to Rahm. The recreational potential of the Upper Selway will be utilized in a number of ways. Road improvement is the most important, but semi-primitive picnic and camping sites will be set up as well as outlying hunter camps. Identification signs for scenic views and some historical, interpretative signs will be erected. Roadside, streamside, and lakeside viewing areas will be provided.

These plans have considerable appeal to a great many people, but not to those who dis-

like overcrowded managed areas with "canned" recreation features.

"Must we have superhighways leading into our wilderness areas?" asks Mrs. Doris Milner, chairman of the Save-the-Upper Selway Committee, at Hamilton, Mont. "The present road system is ideal for edge-of-wilderness travel. Forest Service plans, if carried out, will make the Upper Selway a carbon copy of other overmanaged recreation areas. We need such areas; but even more, we need the unique qualities found only in wilderness areas."

Mrs. Milner points out that travel in the Selway-Bitterroot and other wilderness areas is increasing each year. This travel is by foot, by horseback, and by canoe—wilderness travel.

Mrs. Milner's committee is only one of several regional groups organized to counteract Forest Service plans for the Upper Selway. Another is the North Idaho Wilderness Committee at Lewiston, with Morton R. Brigham as chairman.

"It's the logging and the road building which has us really worried," says Brigham. "The Upper Selway has soft, thin soil and steep hillsides—so you can't escape erosion. At best, logging in the area will be costly and a marginal operation. The Forest Service has said the allowable annual cut will be 12-million board feet. This would keep a small sawmill busy only a fraction of a year."

According to Rahm, from 117,600 to 173,000 acres has commercial timber totaling a possible 1 billion board feet. He maintains that most of the logging will be some distance from the Selway River and that cutting units will conform to soil and watershed needs.

A Forest Service brochure explains, "Travelers on the Magruder Road, fishermen and floating parties will be remote from timber harvests."

The brochure does not mention that logs must be hauled out over the Magruder Road. In an editorial in the Western News of Hamilton, Mont., Publisher Miles Romney said: "If this unreasonable project would provide a crutch to an ailing lumber industry it might be understood and condoned. Such a timber cut would not pay for the construction of the road already built. It is unbelievable that the rank and file of forestry people approve."

"Siltation caused by logging and road-building will certainly affect efforts to restore salmon runs in the Selway," Brigham said.

One of the most eagerly observed fishery projects in the Northwest is the attempt of the Idaho Fish and Game Department with Federal assistance, to reestablish chinook salmon runs in the Clearwater River and its tributaries.

The program has been in progress for 5 years, and to date more than \$1 million has been spent or allocated. A large share of this amount has gone to build the Selway Falls tunnel, which will provide a safer, easier passage for spawning salmon and steelhead.

The department has not made an official stand on the Upper Selway, but department fishery biologists have been kept closely informed of Forest Service plans. This is natural, since the Selway River is the most important link in the success of the project.

James Keating, area fishery biologist, has observed that "logging, primarily the road-building associated with logging, can and has had in other areas a substantial, harmful effect on stream trout habitat. Effects can range from minor to catastrophic."

He said logging roads have caused severe damage in the South Fork of the Clearwater, where the department has been trying to reestablish the steelhead run. Crowding of streams by logging waste often create

migration blocks, preventing fish from reaching spawning areas. Fish pools are filled in or destroyed through flooding.

Said Keating: "Erosion of silt from logging roads, and other sources, results in highly turbid water. Silt particles settle out in the calm-water spaces beneath the surface of the streambed. Eggs deposited by salmon and steelhead trout are buried in the gravel of riffle areas and silt deposits prevent the development of eggs and/or the emergence of fry—if they survive to that stage."

"The overall effect of these roads on the steelhead, salmon, and trout production will be a matter of degree, related to just how well the Forest Service can plan their roads and control erosion."

The Upper Selway and the million-acre-plus wilderness area is a wildlife paradise. One of the Nation's largest elk herds roams this immense and diverse country. Mule deer and whitetail are plentiful, and there are mountain goats, bighorn sheep, bears, and increasing numbers of moose. Abundant, too, are small game, furbearers, and predators such as the cougar and the bobcat.

The Selway is a sportsman's dream—a place to try real wilderness hunting.

Browse is needed for the elk herds, particularly winter browse, according to Elmer Norberg, Idaho Fish and Game Department game biologist. Much of the country which was burned over by forest fires in the 1920's and 1930's has now been overgrown with young conifers.

"Any effort to provide browse for the major elk herds will have to be elsewhere than in the Magruder district," Morton Brigham states. "Logging would be mainly on the northern slopes and the elk don't use these slopes for winter range. And winter range is what is needed. If the Forest Service sets up buffer zones along the Selway and other streams—as they say they will do—no logging will take place in the zones. Therefore, no browse will be provided in areas where elk concentrate in the winter."

Brigham based his conclusions on personal observations—he's hunted the Selway for years—and on the 1956-57 winter survey of big game made by Norberg. Almost 7,000 elk were counted in the Selway drainage, and fewer than 600 of these were above White Cap Creek and only 186 above the Magruder Ranger Station. Logging is proposed for these areas.

Roadbuilding and logging could also be a disturbing influence on the bands of mountain goats and bighorns. Present access roads are more than adequate, Brigham believes, for entry into the wilderness area. At any rate, roads become snowed in early in the Selway country, so they can be used only during the early part of the big game season.

A large number of western Senators and Representatives have taken an active interest in the Upper Selway problems, including Representative ARNOLD OLSEN of Montana, Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER, of Oregon, and Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho.

In a recent letter to this reporter, Senator CHURCH wrote: "I have just completed writing a long letter to the Secretary of Agriculture asking for a detailed explanation as to why the area was left out by the Forest Service and also asking for some definite answers as to Forest Service plans for the Upper Selway. I have, as you know, had the wild river designation for the Selway extended from the Magruder Ranger Station to Thompson Flat, which I think will afford the area some added protection."

"I stressed to the Secretary that the effectiveness of the wild river category for the Selway could be impaired unless proper conservation methods are applied in the watershed."

Are proposed Forest Service plans "proper conservation methods?" The economic returns of the dribble of timber in the Upper Selway do not seem to justify the great risks

to other more important resources in the area. The deletion of area E from wilderness protection in the first place is highly questionable.

Like any Government bureau with large responsibilities, the Forest Service is subject to pressure from all sorts of conflicting interests. And even within the Forest Service itself, opinions as to what should be done with the Upper Selway are by no means unanimous. The decisions being made at the administrative level are privately opposed by some Forest Service people down the line.

That is not unusual; what is surprising is the Forest Service's apparent reversal in this case of a time-honored policy. The concept of wilderness preservation has been a part of Forest Service tradition since 1924, when a wilderness type unit was established in New Mexico's Gila River National Forest. It was a long step forward in the history of conservation, for few people then shared the Forest Service's view of the need to retain a part of primitive America.

Today the Forest Service has a tremendous responsibility in the guardianship of 54 wilderness areas and 34 primitive areas—plus the entire national forest system. Within 10 years the primitive areas must be reclassified under the Wilderness Act. Other Upper Selway situations will arise—in fact, there are many of them throughout the West right now.

Over in northeastern Oregon, the Minam River Canyon is a storm center; and in Montana the Middle Fork of the Flathead River, among other areas, is embroiled in controversy. These are not purely State or regional problems; they are national problems, for they involve the public lands and rivers which belong to all of the people of the United States.

These lands belong to future generations, too. We have to keep that in mind as the destiny of each area is decided. In the case of the Upper Selway, conservationists feel that too many questions remained unanswered. Time, they say, is needed for impartial surveys of the area's economic and recreational resources and for public discussion of the issues.

THE BALTIC STATES

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, for nations which have existed for centuries, a span of 25 years in their history is a very short period, indeed. But that period is excessively long when foreign elements illegally impose their will upon a helpless people and take over the functions of government.

Such is the fate of the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania which had solemn treaties with the Soviets that their borders and national independence would not be violated.

In spite of the pledged words of the Soviets, the Baltic countries were absorbed into the Soviet sphere 25 years ago this week. The first to fall was Lithuania when it was occupied by the Soviets on June 15. Latvia and Estonia fell into the hands of the Soviets 2 days later, June 17.

This action was accomplished through force of arms and illegal political acts, which the people of these countries could not overcome with objections and vigorous protests.

The illegal character of all governmental acts in these annexed Baltic States, after the occupation of them by the Soviet military forces was understood and officially noted by other governments, most resolutely and explicitly by the Government of the United States. On July 23, 1940, the Under Secretary of State, Sumner Welles, in an official statement said that the independence and territorial integrity of the Baltic States was "deliberately annihilated" by "devious processes." On the basis of these principles as outlined in this statement, the United States continues to recognize these Baltic States as independent nations and refuses to recognize the forceful annexation of them by the Soviet Union.

The attitude of the United States, with respect to this forced annexation into the Soviet Union of these Baltic States, was again restated by the then Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, when on November 30, 1953, he said:

The United States, for its part, maintains the diplomatic recognition which it extended in 1922 to the three Baltic nations. We continue to deal with their diplomatic and consular representatives who served the last independent governments of these states.

The peace-loving people of these Baltic States, like those of any other nation in the world, have the inherent right of self-determination. This has been denied to them through the continued occupation of their homeland by the Soviet aggressor, but they are continually striving to oust the oppressors and once again restore a government of their choice to power.

The present generation of the Baltic States knows no other ruling force except that of the Soviet. It is the fathers and mothers of the present generation who are the leaders in the fight to restore national liberty to the country and individual freedoms to its citizens.

In this fight for their self-determination we must continue to take an active role and take such action which will restore freedom and liberty to the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

We are, at present, determined that Communist forces do not occupy and dominate countries and areas on both hemispheres of this earth. Why then cannot we give greater impetus to free the Baltic States from Soviet occupation and rule?

Survival as a nation is the theme that dominantly runs strong through the hearts of the people of these Baltic nations.

The sacrifices and the tragic fate of these nations shall not have been in vain if this would sound to the free nations a warning of imminent danger of international communism and take action through the United Nations to discuss the Baltic States question. We, as Americans, believe that each nation and its people have the inherent right to a government of their own choice and we should put forth every effort to obtain a

frank and open discussion as to the fate of these forcibly annexed nations.

We are fully aware of the importance of the Baltic States in the common struggle to eliminate Soviet aggression of independent nations. Let us rededicate ourselves to the restoration of liberty and self-determination of these illegally annexed nations and join with them in prayer that their just cause will be realized sooner than expected.

FISHING FLEET SHAKEDOWN

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. VAN DEERLIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the other body today has overwhelmingly voted to amend the foreign aid bill in a manner highly important to our American fishing fleets.

By a vote of 59 to 24, the Senate adopted an amendment proposed by my fellow Californian [Mr. KUCHEL]. It would withhold future aid from any nation illegally interfering with our fishermen on the high seas.

I strongly supported Senator KUCHEL in this effort, Mr. Speaker, and I hope the amendment will be sustained when the foreign aid bill goes to House-Senate conference. I do not favor attaching strings to our foreign assistance; I do not even insist that recipient nations say "thank you." But neither do I think we should continue playing the chump with nations that continue to harass American fishermen in acts of official piracy.

Within the past 2 weeks, four tuna clippers have been apprehended by Peruvian warships while operating well outside the 12-mile limit. One of them, the San Diego-owned *Sun Jason*, was proceeding to shore to seek help for a sick crewman.

The latest assault on our fishing fleets comes almost exactly 2 years after similar difficulties in the waters off Ecuador. If Peru is permitted to use fines and license fees to shake down our boat owners, other Central and South American nations may be tempted to follow suit.

At the first sign of trouble last Friday, I asked my administrative assistant, Siegmund W. Smith, to fly to Peru and investigate the situation personally. Mr. Smith has already learned that our problems may stem from a change in Peruvian law which took effect April 30 of this year. It permits individual port commanders to keep a percentage of all fines and other penalties assessed within their jurisdiction. This, clearly, invites abuse in a manner similar to our own justice of the peace system, now happily outmoded.

As is well known, Mr. Speaker, our domestic fishing industry has suffered severe setbacks in recent years because of rising competition from other fish-producing countries. If that industry must add to its burdens the payment of

tribute to competing nations without protection or assistance from Government, then we may quickly see its demise.

For the record, let me list the annual U.S. aid now channeled to Peru. That nation receives \$28.6 million in general economic aid, \$10.5 in military assistance, \$14.7 in food for peace, \$5.3 in emergency relief—and \$3.7 from voluntary American relief agencies. Further, Peru is the recipient of a long-term loan of \$28.2 million through the Export-Import Bank.

It must be made perfectly clear and binding, Mr. Speaker, that American generosity does have its limits—limits imposed by self-respect.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CUNNINGHAM (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD) for today on account of death in the family.

Mr. MACDONALD (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) for the remainder of the week on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MICHEL for 15 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BARRETT.

Mr. CABELL.

Mr. MICHEL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GROVER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. UTT.

Mr. CRAMER.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROYBAL.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 16. An act for the relief of Eugeninsz Lupinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 68. An act for the relief of Mehdi Heravi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 130. An act for the relief of Felicidad Caletena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 207. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose S. Lastra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 248. An act for the relief of Violet Shina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 358. An act for the relief of Vladimir Gasparovic and Dragica Rendulic Gasparovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 372. An act for the relief of Antonio Jesus Senra (Rodriguez) and his wife, Mercedes M. Miranda de Senra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 374. An act for the relief of Dr. Guillermo Castriello (Fernandez); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 454. An act for the relief of Lee Hyang Na; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 517. An act for the relief of John William Daugherty, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 521. An act for the relief of Maria Gioconda Femia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 550. An act for the relief of Patrick Anthony Linnane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 551. An act for the relief of Richard Bing-Yin Lam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 573. An act for the relief of Dr. Sedat M. Ayata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 614. An act for the relief of Evangelia Moshou Kantas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 653. An act for the relief of George Paluras (Georgios Palouras); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 678. An act for the relief of Lee Hi Sook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 703. An act for the relief of Kimie Okamoto Addington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 778. An act for the relief of Nicola Moric; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 857. An act for the relief of Mrs. Styliani Papathanasiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1281. An act for the relief of Sister Maria Clotilde Costa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1483. An act to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 1495. An act to permit variation of the 40-hour workweek of Federal employees for educational purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1496. An act to repeal the provisions of law codified in title 5, section 39, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1620. An act to consolidate the two judicial districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable transitional provisions with respect thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1698. An act to establish a procedure for a review of proposed bank mergers so as to eliminate the necessity for the dissolution of merged banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 15, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1215. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 28, 1965, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim report on the Lincoln, Clifty Creek, and Patoka Reservoirs, Wabash River

Basin, Ind., and Ill., in partial response to resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted May 6, 1958, and April 20, 1948 (H. Doc. No. 202); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with four illustrations.

1216. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 28, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the reports on Bayou Bodcau Reservoir, Bayou Bodcau, and Red Chute, Loggy, Black, and Cypress Bayous, Ark., and La., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 13, 1956, and May 23, 1957 (H. Doc. No. 203); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with eight illustrations.

1217. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of negotiation of noncompetitive fixed-unit-price contracts for procurement of helium-bearing gas without adequate determination of reasonableness of prices, Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1218. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report relative to consenting to the renewal of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas, pursuant to Public Law 88-115; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1219. A letter from the chairman, board of directors, Future Farmers of America, transmitting a report on the audit of the accounts of the Future Farmers of America for fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to Public Law 88-504; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1220. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft proposed legislation to amend title 35, United States Code, to permit the publication of patent applications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1221. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports of visa petitions approved, pursuant to section 204(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1222. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the conservation, protection, and propagation of native species of fish and wildlife, including migratory birds, that are threatened with extinction; to consolidate the authorities relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of the national wildlife refuge system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1223. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report relative to the transfer of \$1,196,000 of fiscal year 1965 research and development funds to the construction of facilities appropriation, pursuant to section 3 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for fiscal year 1965 (78 Stat. 310, 311); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of June 10, 1965, the following bill was reported on June 11, 1965:

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 8926. A bill to provide for the coinage of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 509). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted June 14, 1965]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HAYS: From the U.S. House of Representatives delegation to the 10th Conference of Members of Parliament From the NATO Countries. Report of the U.S. House of Representatives delegation to the 10th Conference of Members of Parliament From the NATO Countries, held in Paris, November 16-20, 1964 (Rept. No. 510). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 419. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 6927, a bill to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 511). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 420. Resolution for consideration of S. 2089, an act to provide assistance to the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters; without amendment (Rept. No. 512). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DENTON: Committee of conference. H.R. 6767. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 513). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 9019. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H.R. 9020. A bill to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel cost for applicants invited by a department to visit it for purposes connected with employment; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 9021. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to require that any rental or cooperative housing constructed in the redevelopment of an urban renewal area shall be designed for low- and middle-income groups; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 9022. A bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, to provide financial assistance in the construction and operation of public elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by a major disaster; to eliminate inequities in the application of Public Law 815 in certain military base closings; to make uniform eligibility requirements for school districts in Public Law 874; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9023. A bill to provide a uniform period for daylight saving time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 9024. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to require standards for controlling the emission of pollutants from gasoline-powered or diesel-powered vehicles, to establish a Federal Air Pollution Control Laboratory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9025. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide a new system of overtime compensation for postal field service employees, to eliminate compensatory time in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 9026. A bill to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 9028. A bill to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H.R. 9029. A bill to provide for retroactive awards of the Army's Combat Infantryman and Medical Badges and for awards of the Bronze Star Medal; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9029. A bill to establish a 2-year period during which certain decorations may be awarded for acts or service performed during World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 9030. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 9031. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the public from unsanitary milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce, without unduly burdening such commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 9032. A bill to appropriate funds for a new shell for the Watergate and other concerts; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 9033. A bill to amend section 601 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that veterans in Alaska may be hospitalized for non-service-connected conditions in private facilities for which the Administrator contracts; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 508. Joint resolution relating to U.S. diplomatic relations with Republics of Ukraine and Byelorussia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.J. Res. 509. Joint resolution that the United States reaffirms its support of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POLANCO-ABREU:

H.J. Res. 510. Joint resolution reaffirming faith in, and support to, the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H. Con. Res. 435. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H. Con. Res. 436. Concurrent resolution to grant relief for people of Baltic States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

309. By Mr. HATHAWAY: Joint resolution of the 102d Maine Legislature urging upgrading of economy of Washington County; to the Committee on Public Works.

310. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, opposing

the passage of H.R. 8147 relating to reducing the existing tariff schedules; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

311. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, relative to the donation of Federal surplus property to State civil defense agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

312. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to requesting that the Morrill Act be amended so as to enable States to invest their grants in corporate equities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

313. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, expressing opposition to the proposed elimination of the U.S. Army Reserve and reorganization of the National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

314. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to construction of a highway through Washington County, Maine; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 9034. A bill for the relief of Michael Buscemi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9035. A bill for the relief of Anna Mastrangelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 9036. A bill for the relief of J. M. Pendarvis, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 9037. A bill for the relief of Barbara H. Jefferson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9038. A bill for the relief of Herman James Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 9039. A bill for the relief of certain civilian employees and former civilian employees of the Bureau of Reclamation at the Columbia Basin project, Washington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 9040. A bill for the relief of Mr. Ioannis Grimbilas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 9041. A bill to restore to the heirs of the Indian grantor certain tribal land of the Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

228. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Shasta County Board of Supervisors, Redding, Calif., relative to repeal of right-to-work laws; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

229. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Fishing Bridge, Wyo., relative to the creation of a National Boxing Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 14, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

Rev. Alexander Veinbergs, president, the Federation of Latvian Evangelical

Lutheran Churches in America, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Dear Father, Creator of heaven and earth, on this day of 14th of June, when the three Baltic nations commemorate in sorrow the dreadful wave of violence against thousands of innocent people who were taken from their homes and loved ones and deported to mass slavery and mass graves in a far and unkind land, we thank Thee, O Lord, for the freedom we all enjoy here. We pray Thee, Lord, to protect this country and its people. Teach us to comprehend and accept Thy grace, which descends each new day upon us. Bless this Government—by the people, for the people, of the people. Guide with Thy gracious hand the work of this legislative body.

Help us to do more than to feel pity or sympathy for the oppressed: Help us to keep for ourselves, and help us to help others keep, faith—faith in Thee, faith in human dignity, faith in freedom and justice for all, through Thee. Help us to do the works of faith.

We pray with ardent hearts, O Lord: Save the world from hate. It was the ideology of hate, and the brutal force behind it, which robbed the three courageous, freedom-loving Baltic nations of their national independence 25 years ago this week and this summer. In the spirit of the One who first prayed "Father, forgive them," we pray for those who cause malice and suffering—then and there or now and everywhere. If it is done, and may still be done tomorrow, in the name of false gods, help us and help the world to overthrow those gods. Help us to witness with words and deeds:

"How great are Thy works, O Lord!
Thy thoughts are very deep!
The dull man cannot know, the stupid cannot understand this:
That, though the wicked sprout like grass and all evildoers flourish,
They are doomed to destruction forever,
But Thou, O Lord, art on high forever."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 11, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 11, 1965, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 800) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 400. Concurrent resolution to provide for printing additional copies of House document entitled "Documents Illustrative of the Formation of the Union of the American States";

H. Con. Res. 411. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of "Communist Activities in the Buffalo, N.Y., Area," 88th Congress, 1st session;

H. Con. Res. 412. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House report No. 1739, 88th Congress, 2d session, entitled "Annual Report for the Year 1963, Committee on Un-American Activities";

H. Con. Res. 413. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of "Violation of State Department Travel Regulations and Pro-Castro Propaganda Activities in the United States," parts 1 through 5;

H. Con. Res. 414. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of "Communist Activities in the Minneapolis, Minn., Area," 88th Congress, 2d session;

H. Con. Res. 415. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of a report on the Sino-Soviet conflict by the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, together with hearings thereon held by that subcommittee, and of additional copies thereof; and

H. Con. Res. 428. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of "History of the House of Representatives," and for other purposes.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following concurrent resolutions were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. Con. Res. 400. Concurrent resolution to provide for printing additional copies of House document entitled "Documents Illustrative of the Formation of the Union of the American States";

H. Con. Res. 411. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of "Communist Activities in the Buffalo, N.Y., area," 88th Congress, 1st session;

H. Con. Res. 412. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House report No. 1739, 88th Congress, 2d session, entitled "Annual Report for the Year 1963, Committee on Un-American Activities";

H. Con. Res. 413. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of "Violation of State Department Travel Regulations and Pro-Castro Propaganda Activities in the United States," parts 1 through 5;